

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-560

S. 902

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 902.....	1.
Digest of Public Law 89-560.....	2



## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 902

Feb. 1, 1965	Sen. Ellender introduced S. 902, which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Feb. 2, 1965	Sen. Williams, N. J., introduced and discussed S. 947, which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill and remarks of author.
Apr. 14, 1966	Sen. Javits was added as co-sponsor of S. 902.
May 18, 1966	Senate committee voted to report S. 902.
May 19, 1966	Senate committee reported S. 902 with amendments. S. Rept. 1180. Print of bill and report.
May 23, 1966	Senate passed S. 902 as reported.
July 14, 1966	House subcommittee of Agriculture Committee approved S. 902.
July 19, 1966	House committee voted to report S. 902.
Aug. 3, 1966	House committee reported S. 902 with amendments. H. Rept. 1804. Print of bill and report.
Aug. 15, 1966	House passed S. 902 as reported.
Aug. 25, 1966	Senate concurred in House amendments to S. 902.
Sept. 25, 1966	Approved: Public Law 89-560

Hearings: H. Agriculture Committee on S. 902.



## DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-560

SOIL SURVEY PROGRAM. Facilitates cooperative assistance to States and subdivisions in community and resource development in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farm and nonfarm areas. Directs the Secretary of Agriculture, upon request of a State or other public agency to provide such assistance as he deems advisable in the making of studies and reports necessary for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil, intensification of the use and benefits of the National Cooperative Soil Survey, furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for use of soil surveys, and consultation with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work under this act with the related work of other agencies.





# SOIL SURVEYS FOR COMMUNITY PLAN- NING AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY  
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING,  
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.  
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 902, H.R. 2076, H.R. 6423, H.R. 13552,  
and H.R. 13566

---

JULY 14, 1966

---

Serial NN

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1966

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina, *Chairman*

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Vice Chairman*

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas  
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina  
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi  
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia  
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri  
HARLAN HAGAN, California  
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky  
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas  
JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana  
ALEC G. OLSON, Minnesota  
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii  
MASTON O'NEAL, Georgia  
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington  
JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, New York  
LYNN E. STALBAUM, Wisconsin  
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas  
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania  
JOHN C. MACKIE, Michigan  
ROLLAND REDLIN, North Dakota  
BERT BANDSTRA, Iowa  
STANLEY L. GREIGG, Iowa  
CLAIR A. CALLAN, Nebraska

PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania  
PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma  
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California  
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota  
MRS. CATHERINE MAY, Washington  
RALPH HARVEY, Indiana  
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois  
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas  
LAURENCE J. BURTON, Utah  
PRENTISS WALKER, Mississippi  
GEORGE V. HANSEN, Idaho

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Puerto Rico

MRS. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*

HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Clerk*

JOHN J. HEIMBURGER, *General Counsel*

FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Staff Consultant*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas  
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky  
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina  
STANLEY L. GREIGG, Iowa  
CLAIR A. CALLAN, Nebraska  
SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Puerto Rico

RALPH HARVEY, Indiana  
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California  
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas

# CONTENTS

---

H.R. 2076, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes-----	Page 5
S. 902, an act to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes-----	1
Senate Report 1180, 89th Congress, 2d session, soil information assistance for community planning and resource development-----	2
Statement of—	
Dechant, Tony T., president, National Farmers Union-----	38
Dow, Hon. John G., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York-----	26
Graf, Robert E., chairman, Rural-Urban Affairs Committee, National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts-----	33
Kee, Hon. James, a Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia-----	36
Nelson, George H., president, Law Engineering Testing Co-----	35
Philbin, Hon. Philip J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts-----	21
Reynolds, Gardner M., director, district 1, American Society of Civil Engineers-----	31
Waggoner, Eugene B., president, Consulting Engineers Council of the U.S.A-----	24
Watkins, G. Reynolds, chairman, Professional Engineers in Private Practice, Functional Section, the National Society of Professional Engineers-----	28
Williams, Donald A., Administrator, Soil Survey Interpretations, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture-----	5
Correspondence submitted to the subcommittee:	
Anderson, Kenneth W., Grand Rapids, Mich., letter of June 28, 1966--	38
Baring, Hon. Walter S., a Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada, letter of July 11, 1966-----	12
Barr, James R., Barr & Associates, Kodiak, Alaska, letter of June 30, 1966-----	39
Campbell, Ian, State geologist, State of California, letter of June 7, 1966-----	11
Freeman, Hon. Orville, L., Secretary of Agriculture, letter of January 26, 1965, to the President of the Senate-----	4
Fried, Aaron D., planning director, Rockland County Planning Board, New City, N.Y., letter of June 30, 1966-----	27
Gedwill, Joseph, P., president, Consulting Engineers Council of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nev., letter of June 11, 1966-----	14
Krametbauer, Victor G., United Testing Laboratories, Inc., Las Vegas, Nev., letter of June 1, 1966-----	12
Lambie, John A., county engineer, county of Los Angeles, Calif., letter of July 1, 1966-----	11
Lowney, John V., and Oscar J. Seherer, Nevada Testing Labs, Ltd., Las Vegas, Nev., letter of June 11, 1966-----	14
Matsunaga, Hon. Spark M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii, letter of July 8, 1966-----	12
Millard, David, vice president, R. W. Millard & Associates, Inc., Elko, Nev., letter of June 7, 1966-----	14
Quay, John R., A.I.A., Barrington, Ill., letter of July 8, 1966-----	10
Sergant, Gordon E., P.E., Gordon E. Sergant & Associates, Spring Grove, Ill, letter of February 11, 1966-----	9
Wight, George, Wight Consulting Engineers, Barrington, Ill., letter of May 18, 1966-----	10
Williams, D. A., Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, letter of June 30, 1966-----	30



# SOIL SURVEYS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

---

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1966

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND CREDIT  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1302, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. W. R. Poage (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Poage, Gathings, Hagen of California, Greigg, Callan, Teague of California, Dole, and Burton of Utah.

Also present: John J. Heimbürger, general counsel; Francis M. LeMay, consultant; Hyde H. Murray, assistant clerk; Jane C. Wojcik, staff; and Fowler C. West, staff.

Mr. POAGE. The subcommittee will please come to order.

The subcommittee is met this morning for consideration of S. 902 and a number of similar bills on the subject of a soil survey program. One of these bills by Mr. Philbin was reported by the committee more than 2 years ago. It was reported out and passed by the full committee. It did not become law because of a lack of action by the other body, I believe.

I should point out that the Senate bill is before us today.

I believe that we will start with Mr. Williams of the Soil Conservation Service who is present. He will explain the views of the Department.

We will be glad to start with you now.

(S. 902 together with S. Rept. 1180 follow:)

[S. 902, 89th Cong., 2d sess.]

AN ACT to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in recognition of the increasing need for soil surveys by States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development for protecting and improving the quality of the environment, meeting recreational needs, conserving land and water resources, providing for multiple uses of such resources, and controlling and reducing pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farmlands being shifted to other uses, resulting from rapid expansions in the uses of land for industry, housing, transportation, recreation, and related services, it is the sense of Congress that the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture should be conducted so as to make available soil surveys to meet such needs of the States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development.

SEC. 2. In order to provide soil surveys to assist States, their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, towns, cities, planning boards and



commissions, community development districts, and other public agencies in community planning and resource development for the protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, recreational development, the conservation of land and water resources, the development of multiple uses of such resources, and the control and prevention of pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farm and nonfarm areas, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the request of a State or other public agency, provide by means of such cooperative arrangements with the State or other public agency as he may deem advisable, the following assistance with respect to such areas and purposes:

(1) the making of studies and reports necessary for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil;

(2) an intensification of the use and benefits of the National Cooperative Soil Survey;

(3) the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys; and

(4) consultation with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work under this Act with the related work of such other agencies.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the Secretary shall make a reasonable effort to assure that the contributions of any State or other public agency under any cooperative agreement which may be entered into between the Secretary and such State or other public agency with respect to a soil survey shall be a substantial portion of the cost of such soil survey.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

Passed the Senate May 23, 1966.

Attest:

EMERY L. FRAZIER, *Secretary*.

[S. Rept. 1180, 89th Cong., 2d sess.]

#### SOIL INFORMATION ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 902) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

#### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies to assist them in community planning and resource development, including planning for such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities, and water and sewage facilities.

#### COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The committee had before it S. 902, introduced by Senator Ellender and Senator Javits, and S. 947, introduced by Senator Williams of New Jersey, substantially identical bills. The committee substitute does not differ in substance from either of these bills. The purpose of the substitute is to make it clear that the bill would be applicable to farm as well as nonfarm areas, and that it is part of the general pattern of agricultural legislation providing for soil surveys, conservation, changes in farmland use, and community development districts.

#### NEED FOR THE BILL

Community development districts, soil conservation districts, planning and zoning boards and commissions, and other local units of government need soil surveys as a basis for developing long-range plans and programs for the orderly development of rural communities and the renewal of natural resources in areas of rapidly changing land use.

Traditionally, soil surveys have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of a soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreational facilities. Soil surveys include maps of the kinds of soil, which are interpreted according to such qualities as soil wetness, overflow hazards, depth to rock, hardpans, permeability, erodibility, shrink-swell potential, and hazard of slippage on slopes. Soil surveys provide information that can be used to predict the results of using specific kinds of soil in different ways.

The enactment of this bill would clarify and restate policy for the Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies about work in areas of rapid changes in land use and where careful advanced planning is essential to avoid huge losses of both private and public investments. It would facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in both rural areas undergoing drastic changes in land use and in areas of rapid development. In many areas soil surveys are essential for community planning. Enactment of this bill would provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities. It is not intended that soil surveys would be made of the built-up centers of metropolitan areas.

The Department of Agriculture, with its cooperators in the National Cooperative Soil Survey, has responsibility for soil surveys and has a trained staff of capable specialists to provide essential technical information about soil, water, and plant resources needed by community planners and others. The bill extends methods already tested and known to help develop solutions to problems in community planning and the safe and efficient use of soil and water resources.

The increased demands for soil surveys in areas of rapid growth and for community development would be provided for by the enactment of this bill. The important task of making soil surveys on the farm and ranch lands of the Nation would be maintained in proper balance.

Many local units of government already contribute funds to assist the Department of Agriculture and its cooperators in carrying out soil surveys urgently needed for planning ahead of rapid growth or land-use adjustment. Funding arrangements are included in cooperative agreements between the Soil Conservation Service and the applicable local unit government. The enactment of this bill would stimulate more local effort and financing for soil surveys in specific areas. It will not cost any appreciable amount of additional Federal funds.

In addition to the assistance of the State agricultural experiment stations and other State agencies, in fiscal year 1966 the Department of Agriculture made financial arrangements with local governments for contributions amounting to approximately \$600,000 for speeding up the completion of soil surveys in specific areas. In fiscal year 1964 these local contributions totaled about \$225,000.

In a great many parts of the country a clear-cut distinction no longer exists between rural and urban living. As modern highways are built many nonfarm people establish their homes in rural areas. To achieve good living for both, advanced community planning is essential. Such areas have new and compelling needs for water management, sewage disposal, schools, recreation areas, and other facilities. Such planning requires accurate knowledge of the soils and their alternative potentials in order to avoid serious losses of investment and construction and maintenance costs. To solve these problems the results of the soil surveys and technical assistance should be available to the planning agencies, the residents, and other public and private service agencies.

At the present time, about 10 percent of the 50 million acres being mapped annually in the National Cooperative Soil Survey is located in communities facing urgent planning problems. Not over 10 percent of this, or about 500,000 acres, will be used for housing and similar intensive uses; since about 10 or 15 times as much land as is needed for such uses must be surveyed in order to determine suitable alternative sites therefor. The land not devoted to such uses will be used for farming, forestry, recreation, and other less intensive uses, so that co-operatively financed soil surveys to determine sites for intensive uses helps to provide soil information for agricultural and other less intensive uses. At the present rate of survey work in communities facing urgent planning problems it would require some 20 to 30 years to complete the soil surveys needed by such communities.

In the meantime many costly mistakes would be made, mistakes that could be avoided through the use of soil surveys for a tiny fraction of the cost. Already the officials of hundreds of land-use planning bodies are depending on published



soil surveys. This places a new emphasis and new urgency on the acceleration of their completion.

Soil surveys have already saved untold millions of dollars of both private and public investment. Estimates made by community planners of the value of soil surveys run as high as \$2 million per year for a county. Hundreds of examples have been cited where many thousands of dollars are lost annually through poor site selection for specific uses. In many instances amounts up to one-quarter million dollars have been saved by choosing the right site for individual school buildings. Further examples of other great losses that can be avoided through site selection and the planning of proper measures include: Flooded homes and basements; failures of on-site sewage disposal systems; failures of buildings and highways due to poor-bearing qualities of soils; and excessive construction costs of roads, utility lines, pipelines, and so on.

We should double or triple the present rate of completing soil surveys in areas undertaking community planning to take care of rapid expansion and economic growth. This would mean mapping at least 10 to 15 million acres annually in such areas. At current price levels the cost would amount to about 50 cents per acre. At the present rate of completing soil surveys in such areas, population would have increased by 50 percent in the meantime. From past experience it is clear that enormous investments by individuals and by public agencies would be lost. These can be avoided by use of soil surveys. The enactment of this bill would give emphasis to the need for moving ahead to avoid these enormous preventable losses of private and public investments.

#### DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

The Department of Agriculture recommends enactment of this legislation as a means to help provide an orderly transition from rural to urban land uses. This requires information on soils for location of industry, commerce, residential housing, parks and recreational areas, and strategic open space. Many urban areas seek to preserve open space in a rural setting. Soil surveys provide scientific information for interpretations and judgment decisions related to the capabilities and limitations for land for different uses and for management of soils during transition and under the new uses. The Department of Agriculture is currently supplying many of the services needed for rural-urban planning through its soil survey, extension, rural areas development, watershed planning, forestry, and economic research programs.

Although the Department already has authority to make soil surveys, the proposed bill would serve essentially to give clear-cut recognition and emphasis to the need for such surveys and interpretive services for areas making specific requests. This is highly important to further cooperative efforts of rural and urban people.

Enactment of this proposal would encourage local and State organizations to make additional contributions to this type of activity.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, while there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program, this advice does not involve any commitment that appropriations to the Department of Agriculture under this proposed legislation would be recommended.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*



(H.R. 6423, introduced by Mr. Freylinghuysen; H.R. 13552, introduced by Mr. Dow; and H.R. 13566, introduced by Mr. Kee, are similar to H.R. 2076, introduced by Mr. Philbin, the text of which follows:)

[H.R. 2076, 89th Cong., 1st sess.]

**A BILL** To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other non-agricultural use areas, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, resulting in the discontinuance of farming operations on large areas of agricultural land and the consequent serious deterioration of such agricultural land and other land through erosion by wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural and other land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing severe problems concerning needed changes in the use of such land and the effects of such changes on the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and other public agencies for the purpose of providing assistance in planning for such changes in land use and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, and thereby assist in preserving and protecting the Nation's soil and water resources.

**SEC. 2.** In order to cooperate with and assist States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation district, regional, State, and local planning boards and commissions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon the request of the State or other public agency, to—

(1) make investigations and surveys in connection with the classification and mapping of soils in such areas;

(2) make studies necessary for the interpretation of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made by or available to the Secretary;

(3) furnish technical and advisory assistance for the protection, development, and economic utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas in connection with the planning by the State or other public agency for orderly adjustment in land use in such areas; and

(4) consult with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work authorized under this Act with the related work of such other agencies.

**SEC. 3.** There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

# **STATEMENT OF DONALD A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR, ACCOMPANIED BY A. A. KLINGEBIEL, DIRECTOR, SOIL SURVEY INTERPRETATIONS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I have a short statement with respect to this subject.

I am grateful for this opportunity to again appear before this subcommittee. I want to thank the chairman and each member for the courtesy and cooperation I have received as we have had opportunity to discuss soil and water conservation work and activities and to share in the overall efforts on behalf of the farmers and others who have interests in the conservation and development of the natural resources of the Nation.

Secretary Freeman appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture on June 9, 1966, and made the statement "We have

become an urban-oriented nation, preoccupied with problems of suburban sprawl and inner city decay, social strife and congestion, rising welfare costs, the juvenile delinquency." Mr. Freeman suggested an alternative to change this movement to the large cities by increasing needed facilities and services in our small rural communities. He suggested community development districts as a way to explore this alternative.

Community development districts, soil conservation districts, planning and zoning boards and commissions, and other local units of government need soil surveys as a basis for developing long-range plans and programs for the orderly development of rural communities and the renewal of natural resources in areas of rapidly changing land use.

Traditionally, soil surveys have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of a soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreational facilities. Soil surveys include maps of the kinds of soil, which are interpreted according to such qualities as soil wetness, overflow hazards, depth to rock, hardpans, permeability, erodibility, shrink-swell potential, and hazard of slippage on slopes. Soil surveys provide information that can be used to predict the results of using specific kinds of soil in different ways.

The enactment of this bill would clarify and restate policy for the Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies about work in areas of rapid changes in land use and where careful advanced planning is essential to avoid huge losses of both private and public investments. It would facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in both rural areas undergoing drastic changes in land use and in areas of rapid development. In many areas soil surveys are essential for community planning. Enactment of this bill would provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities. It is not intended that soil surveys would be made of the built-up centers of metropolitan areas.

The increased demands for soil surveys in areas of rapid growth and for community development would be provided for by the enactment of this bill. The important task of making soil surveys on the farm and ranchlands of the Nation would be maintained in proper balance.

Many local units of government already contribute funds to assist the Department of Agriculture and its cooperators in carrying out soil surveys urgently needed for planning ahead of rapid growth or land use adjustment. Funding arrangements are included in cooperative agreements between the Soil Conservation Service and the applicable local unit government. The enactment of this would stimulate more local effort and financing for soil surveys in specific areas. It will not cost any appreciable amount of additional Federal funds.

In addition to the assistance of the State agricultural experiment stations and other State agencies, in fiscal year 1966 the Department of Agriculture made financial arrangements with local governments for contributions amounting to approximately \$600,000 for speeding up the completion of soil surveys in specific areas. In fiscal year 1964 these local contributions totaled about \$225,000.



In a great many parts of the country a clear-cut distinction no longer exists between rural and urban living. As modern highways are built many nonfarm people establish their homes in rural areas. To achieve good living for both, advanced community planning is essential. Such areas have new and compelling needs for water management, sewage disposal, schools, recreation areas, and other facilities. Such planning requires accurate knowledge of the soils and their alternative potentials in order to avoid serious losses of investment and construction and maintenance costs. To solve these problems, the results of the soil surveys and technical assistance should be available to the planning agencies, the residents, and other public and private service agencies.

Soil surveys have already saved untold millions of dollars of both private and public investment. Estimates made by community planners of the value of soil surveys run as high as \$2 million per year for a county. Hundreds of examples have been cited where many thousands of dollars are lost annually through poor site selection for specific uses. In many instances amounts up to one-quarter million dollars have been saved by choosing the right site for individual school buildings. Further examples of other great losses that can be avoided through site selection and the planning of proper measures include: Flooded homes and basements; failures of on-site sewage disposal systems; failures of buildings and highways due to poor bearing qualities of soils; and excessive construction costs of roads, utility lines, pipelines and so on.

I would like to comment briefly on S. 902 as passed by the Senate on May 23, 1966. For all intent and purpose, the amended version as passed by the Senate and the House bills, H.R. 2076, H.R. 6423, H.R. 13552, and H.R. 13566 are the same. The revised wording in S. 902 states more clearly the intent of the Department relative to the need for soil surveys in areas of expanding uses of land for industry, housing, and other uses. The House Bills read such that the Secretary of Agriculture needs new authority to make soil surveys in areas of rapid changes in land use. Soil surveys are being made in these areas now as these areas are part of the regular schedule for completing soil surveys. There is need for a clarification and restatement of authority and a need for giving some priority to these areas being taken up by the rapid changes to more intensive uses.

The amended version of S. 902 also stresses the making of cooperative arrangements with local units of government for making studies and reports for mapping in these intensive use areas and that public agencies entering into agreement shall bear a substantial portion of the cost. Although these cooperative arrangements are not new, they are not specifically mentioned in the House bills before this committee. We favor the present version of S. 902.

I would like to digress for a moment and discuss briefly some opposition that has been voiced following the passage of S. 902 in the Senate. Several members of the Consulting Engineers Council, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., expressed concern regarding the intent of S. 902. They interpreted soil surveys as described in this bill to replace the need for on-site investigation for specific construction sites.

Members of the Soil Conservation Service met with Mr. Larry Spiller and Mr. John Gnaedinger of the council on June 10, 1966,

and discussed Service policies regarding soil surveys and their use. Statements from the Merrimack County, N.H., published soil survey were used as an example of the kinds of soil engineering interpretations that would be made from soil surveys and their limitations for use under the act. These statements satisfied the two representatives from the Engineering Council and they expressed the opinion that based on this information they could support the bill. They agreed to work with the Soil Conservation Service in developing additional language clarifying the intent of the legislation.

We understand that the Consulting Engineering Council will propose the following amendments to S. 902:

Amend section 2, page 4, line 25, by deleting the word "full" from the sentence and by inserting the following new paragraph on page 5 following line 5:

The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works.

Any sites of interest to consulting engineers would be specific construction sites. This amendment is not needed inasmuch as the soil survey program has never been administered so as to interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works nor is there any intent to do so. We would hope that this statement will provide sufficient assurance to the Consulting Engineering Council to satisfy its concerns in this regard. However, if the committee wishes to adopt this amendment we would have no objection.

Soil surveys as completed by the Department of Agriculture and interpretations thereof, could be highly beneficial to those people doing soil testing work or engaged in construction engineering. Soil surveys show the location and extent of the different kinds of soil. They provide information about soil properties to the depth of about 6 feet and in some instances, predictions about soil behavior can be made to 10 or more feet in depth.

These soil maps properly interpreted are a valuable guide to engineers regarding the kinds of problems they may expect such as wetness, rock, low-bearing strength, shrink-swell potential, and the like. Through the use of soil surveys, engineers can make more accurate estimates on construction costs and avoid many problems that might otherwise be encountered. The surveys also help them to determine the location and spacing of samples to be analyzed in the laboratory and the area under which the data can be applied.

Soil maps are not designed or intended to be used in lieu of on-site evaluation or sampling for specific construction sites. They are meant to complement, not duplicate, the work of the engineers. We have had numerous compliments from engineering firms on how beneficial they find soil surveys in carrying out their work.

The rate of completing soil surveys in areas undertaking community planning to take care of rapid expansion and economic growth should be accelerated as rapidly as budgetary considerations will permit. From experience in the past, it is clear that enormous investments by individuals and by public agencies can be protected by means of soil surveys. The enactment of this bill would give emphasis to the



need for moving ahead to avoid these enormous preventable losses of private and public investments.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record copies of a few letters from consulting engineers and architects supporting this work and our position, if I may do so.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, they will be made a part of the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall make reference to them, in brief. One is from Gordon E. Sergeant & Associates, consulting engineers, of Spring Grove, Ill.; another from Wight Consulting Engineers, of Barrington, Ill.; another from John R. Quay, of Barrington, Ill.; another is from the Division of Mines and Geology, San Francisco, Calif.; another is from the County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

(The letters referred to follow:)

GORDON E. SERGANT & ASSOCIATES,  
Spring Grove, Ill., February 11, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Soil Conservation Service,  
Woodstock, Ill.

(Attention: Mr. Sam Haning.)

DEAR MR. HANING: As Director of the Conservation Service of our area, you have co-operated in every respect, in those times when we have requested information about the County's soil, etc. and we are grateful for this consideration.

Our Company, as an engineering service, is in constant need of various information about the areas in which we work, relative to soils, terrain character, elevations, drainage, absorption abilities and vegetation growth. As land developers, designers of roads, designers of sewage and water programs, as well as building construction, it is vital that we have as much information as possible to aid our clients in the field in which we are engaged.

We have found that the information the soil conservation service has is a great help to us in the pre-planning stage of land development and drainage control because of the agricultural mapping done by your department.

The soil borings you use for soil typing is information that is helpful in the showing of soil changes over a large area. Although our soil borings are much deeper, to determine bearing purposes, water table levels, feasibility for installation of sewer and water, etc., these borings you make for agricultural use, indicate uniformity, or non-uniformity in soil character. This information enables us, in many instances, to know to what extent our sub-surface work will be needed.

Your service, with the type of borings you make, is particularly useful in the plotting of roads through planned subdivisions. (Drainage sub-surface soil character to shallow depths, etc.)

I mention just a few of the uses to which we put your "Service" information, as you are well aware of our work with you over the past eight years. Several weeks ago we asked you to get some information for us on DuPage County, as you probably remember. I was surprised the County was not mapped as McHenry County is. However, the information we did get was from the individual farm information which the "Service" plots. This of course, was a great deal of help.

I would expect the continued efforts of the Soil Conservation Service to map the rural areas would aid in the engineering of land development for the engineering companies and be a guide for expansion of utility services for municipalities.

I have pointed out to you however, in discussions about the "other than agricultural uses of your service", the danger of this information in the hands of non-professionals, especially when there is no expert report applying the information and its relation to given areas. I have seen well meaning planning commissions exclude from development, areas of great potential by misusing the information given to them and once a decision is made by them, no amount of explanation, design criteria, or common sense can change that decision. Some of the seemingly most undesirable locations have become our best developments where small lakes, ponds, fill programs and drainways have been incorporated into a design. Under good programming, many poor areas are divided into large tracts, allowing for good safe building sites, but leaving for the most part, the existing terrain in it's natural state and the desirable open space.

There is no doubt that the agricultural information of the Soil Conservation Service can be of great help to us in the engineering field, along with the Municipal and Rural Governments. It is part of the information needed in the over-all growth of our communities. It can have immeasurable value as a guide.

I hope we will continue our relationship as in the past and that service will be extended over more agricultural areas so that the information obtained can be used in later Urban and Suburban growth.

Very truly yours,

GORDON E. SERGANT, P.E.

WIGHT CONSULTING ENGINEERS,  
*Barrington, Ill., May 18, 1966.*

Mr. JOHN QUAY,  
*Barrington, Ill.*

DEAR MR. QUAY: We certainly enjoyed our conference with you relative to U.S. Department of Agriculture soil maps and classifications.

As stated during this meeting the use of the information gleaned from the reports and maps are of vital interest during initial phase of engineering investigation.

Preliminary investigation for a client to determine land use, density factors and preliminary estimates of cost is a single most important phase of our engineering analysis. Evaluations of soils maps and classifications at this critical stage reduces the variables significantly, thereby enhancing the value of engineering and economic determinations.

If we can offer any information from our records or recommendations on the utilization of soils information we will be happy to do so.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE WIGHT.

BARRINGTON, ILL., *July 8, 1966.*

Mr. DONALD A. WILLIAMS,  
*Administrator, Soil Conservation Service,  
U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: It has been brought to my attention that Senators Javits and Ellender have introduced into the congressional legislative process a bill which would, under certain specified conditions, authorize the Soil Conservation Service to undertake an expanded soils mapping and soils interpretation program in metropolitan areas.

It is my opinion that such a program would be beneficial not only to society in general but would also be beneficial to the architectural and engineering professions.

Having area wide information available during the early formulative stages of a project would permit the architect-engineer to better advise his client as to the feasibility and advisability of many undertakings. During the second or plan development state, it would be invaluable in pointing out areas and problems that should be investigated by the engineer in greater depth.

Our Society is currently taking a broader and more sophisticated view toward its physical environment. It is now demanding that the designers of the environment—architects, engineers, planners, etc.—incorporate the skills, talents, knowledge and experience of any and all disciplines and authorities that are capable of making a constructive contribution in improving the physical environment.

In my opinion the soil scientist and the Soil Conservation Service can and should be making a major contribution in this field, and if and when such a program gets underway, it will result in more clients making more use of private professional services.

I sincerely hope that the legislature will act favorably on the now-pending legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. QUAY, A.I.A.,  
*Architect.*

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—THE RESOURCES AGENCY,  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,  
DIVISION OF MINES AND GEOLOGY,  
*San Francisco, June 7, 1966.*

MR. T. P. HELSETH,  
*State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
Berkeley, Calif.*

DEAR TOM: Your transmittal note and the copy of your "Soil Survey, Alameda Area, California", must have arrived during our afternoon discussion yesterday, for I found them this morning when I came into the office (after completing the arduous job of voting) for a quiet day of catching up on my mail—and other things!

The timing of your transmission was perfect, for I've had an entirely peaceful hour to review this report and thus have a sounder base than would otherwise be the case, to compliment you and your staff on what strikes me as a thorough-going and thoroughly useful report. If I were an Alameda area citizen owning even as much as half an acre, I'd surely want to have a copy of this report in my home reference library! Moreover, I find nothing in it that would make for concern over "conflicts of interest" or "duplication", such as we were discussing yesterday. The "engineering interpretations" are strictly soil-related and entirely appropriate—as is the section on Geology.

I am particularly impressed by the aerial mosaic maps you have used to portray the distribution of soil types. These form a very valuable appendix and should help a lot in making the survey intelligible to the layman, as well as contributing an excellent record of your mapping work.

Thanks again for letting me have this report, which will go onto the reference shelves of our library.

Sincerely yours,

IAN CAMPBELL, *State Geologist.*

---

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,  
DEPARTMENT OF COUNTY ENGINEER,  
*Los Angeles, Calif., July 1, 1966.*

MR. THOMAS P. HELSETH,  
*State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service,  
U.S. Department of Agriculture.*

DEAR MR. HELSETH: I wanted to again express my appreciation for the cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service in developing the Saugus-Newhall Soil Survey in cooperation with the County of Los Angeles. The excellent printed report has received wide distribution within the County.

For the Department of County Engineer, I have issued an Administrative Instruction in order to assure maximum use of the information in the report. This instruction requires that the regional engineers see that copies of the report are available for use by personnel in the regional offices and the Building and Safety district offices in the area covered by the report, and also that the division heads of Building and Safety, Sanitation, Waterworks, Design, Advanced Planning and Administrative Services, and Industrial Waste Divisions prepare written divisional instructions to their personnel governing the use of the information contained in the report.

Other departments in the County, such as the Health Department, have also received copies for their use and guidance.

I certainly hope that similar reports can be prepared for the Antelope Valley, Malibu-Las Virgenes area and other areas within the County.

It is gratifying to me to see such a forward-looking policy develop within the Soil Conservation Service.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. LAMBIE, *County Engineer.*

MR. POAGE. The Chair would like to ask unanimous consent to insert several letters from certain Members into the record at this point.

And without objection, they will be included at this point in the record.



(The letters referred to follow:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1966.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A matter of deep concern to consulting engineers in Hawaii and elsewhere in the country is the intended scope and meaning of S. 902. The measure was reported out by the Senate Agriculture Committee, without hearings, on May 19, 1966. It was passed by the Senate on May 23, 1966, with very little debate.

As you know, hearings will be held on this and related House bills by the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of your Committee on Agriculture on July 14, 1966.

The legislation, generally, appears to serve an excellent purpose. Dissemination of technical information is essential to our country's welfare, and the Federal government is unquestionably in a superior position to expedite the flow of technical soils information which it has arranged and collated.

However, the use of such soil information clearly involves professional engineering skill and judgment on the specific design of the types of development mentioned in S. 902. It is only natural, therefore, for members of the engineering profession to feel that the private consulting engineer is in the best position to perform these design functions, and with this view I am wholly in accord.

It seems to me that this apparent encroachment by the Federal government upon an area now served by the private consulting engineer is inevitable under Section 2(3) which presently reads: "the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys . . ." The salutary purpose of the measure could be preserved and any unwarranted competition with practicing engineers avoided by the substitution, in lieu of the above-quoted provision, of the following wording: "the furnishing of such explanation as is needed for full understanding of the information contained in these soil surveys . . ."

I strongly urge, therefore, that this suggested amendment be adopted.

It is requested that this letter be entered in the record of hearings.

Aloha and best wishes.

Sincerely,

SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,  
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
Chairman, Agriculture Committee,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am herewith enclosing copies of several letters and telegrams received from my constituents opposing S. 902, a bill providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development.

The opposition as expressed in these letters appears to have much merit and I concur in the views expressed therein.

It is my understanding that hearings are scheduled to commence on July 14th on this legislation and I, therefore, request that these comments and those of my constituents be incorporated in the records of the proceedings.

Sincerely,

WALTER S. BARING,  
Congressman for Nevada.

UNITED TESTING LABORATORIES, INC.,  
Las Vegas, Nev., June 1, 1966.

HON. WALTER S. BARING,  
The House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have just been apprised of Senate Bill 902 which has been brought and passed within the past ten days by the Senate regarding the U. S. Department



of Agriculture providing soils surveys for states, political subdivisions, towns, cities, water districts, etc. as an aid in their preparation of various developments throughout the nation.

Sir, I wish to register the strongest possible protest to any passage of this bill by the House since I feel that it is superfluous as well as potentially dangerous to the general health and welfare of the public for the following reasons:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture performs soils surveys and publishes their reports from the standpoint purely and solely from the agricultural aspect of soil adequacies or deficiencies. Agricultural soil surveys and the science of soil mechanics from the standpoint of foundation for buildings and other structures such as highways, bridges, tunnels, reservoirs, etc. are as different as day from night. For instance, from the agricultural standpoint, one is forever striving to locate a soil or transform a soil into a loose, friable material which will sustain a living plant; permit water to be absorbed for availability to the plant; and permit the free circulation of air into the root zone. This is diametrically opposed to the mechanics involved in the preparation of a foundation material with the soils in relation to the construction of any major facility. Incidentally, I may point out that during the past two years here in the City of Las Vegas two multi-million dollar subdivisions were constructed upon lands that had previously been surveyed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; the report was a public report; and yet, each and every one of the 134 houses constructed upon this property had foundation problems due to the fact that sufficient soil mechanics data by a competent soils engineer were not furnished prior to construction. Recently I have been employed in attempting to arrive to some solution to this utter disaster and to date have not been able to find anyone who has developed any material or solution to foundation problems in these types of soils, yet they are similar in all characteristics to other soils in the immediate vicinity from the standpoint of agricultural purposes. I would be pleased indeed to take you or any of your representatives on a personal tour of this particular area in Las Vegas and adjacent areas and point out in specific detail problems that exist which time does not permit me to enumerate in this correspondence.

I feel that although this bill has passed the Senate, if it actually became law, it would be an injustice to the people of the United States and more particularly the people here in the State of Nevada where a majority of the lands belongs to the U.S. Government. Unsuspecting people who acquired these lands with a prepared agricultural soils survey would be direly misled in the belief that these particular soils would be sufficiently adequate for the development of not only agricultural purposes but building of homes, major civic buildings, etc. The problems of foundation stability may not appear for several months until construction is completed and thereby create other disasters similar to the one previously mentioned.

I understand that Senator Thomas Kuchel (D-California) testified that a municipal reservoir with which he is personally familiar cost an estimated two hundred thousand dollars more than was expected because of soils problems which he believes could have been determined and avoided through consultation with the Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. I do not wish to contradict the Honorable Senator, however, I do not believe the Honorable Senator has all the facts and if he has all the facts, I do not think they are clearly stated.

I believe I speak from personal knowledge since I was born and reared on a farm in southern New Mexico and subsequently pursued my education along the lines of agricultural engineering and have had personal contract with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soils Conservation Service for many years before and after becoming a registered professional engineer and pursuing the profession of consulting engineering, more particularly involved with soil mechanics and the building industry.

Should you desire to have further information submitted to you in Washington, please feel free to call upon Mr. Donald A. Buzzell, Consulting Engineers Council, Madison Building, 1155-15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Very truly yours,

VICTOR G. KRAMETBAUER,  
*Registered Civil Engineer.*

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 1, 1966.*

Representative WALTER BARING,  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D.C.:*

We are very concerned with an opposed to Government competition with consulting soil engineers as expoused in bill S. 902. Our clients include all the public agencies and private parties mentioned by Senator Williams to be benfited by USDA soil engineering. Appreciate your help.

NEVADA TESTING LABS., LTD.,  
JOHN V. LOWNEY.  
OSCAR J. SCHERER.

---

CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL OF NEVADA,  
*Las Vegas, Nev., June 11, 1966.*

Subject: Senate Bill S. 902.  
Hon. WALTER S. BARING,  
*Congressman, State of Nevada,*  
*House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed herewith you will find photocopies of letters from the headquarters office of the Consulting Engineers Council/USA, Washington, D.C., and a photocopy of subject Bill S. 902.

The letters reflect the views of the Consulting Engineers Council of Nevada concerning this bill. The CEC/Nevada objects very strongly to the passage of this bill as it is more than an infringement upon the activities of soils engineers in private enterprise. Senator Harrison Williams remarks contained in the third paragraph of the enclosed letter of May 24th shows complete ignorance of the function, capabilities and abilities of the Soil Conservation Services of the Department of Agriculture. Quoting Senator Williams' "the Soil Conservation Service has the technical know how and long years of experience that town planners, state agencies and individuals find valuable in developing natural resources of the community" unquote. Soils analysis for the construction of heavy structures, (buildings, dams, roads, reservoirs, etc.) is a tricky profession—any soils engineer is well aware of this, where-as the Department of Agriculture's past experiences have been more in the fields of agriculture such as analysis of soils for product growth, irrigation problems and other problems concerned with farming and agriculture. We therefore feel that the problems of soil analysis for heavy construction should be left to the engineers in private enterprise who have had training and long years of experience in that field of endeavor. The Department of Agriculture should be restrained to function in the field for which it was created—agriculture.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH P. GEDWILL, *President.*

---

R. W. MILLARD & ASSOCIATES, INC.,  
*Elko, Nev., June 7, 1966.*

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,  
*Congressman for the State of Nevada,*  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARING: The proposed bill, S. 902, has just been brought to the attention of our firm through a letter from the Consulting Engineers Council. It seems to us that this bill is just another infringement by the Federal Government on private enterprise.

Our firm is more and more faced with the competition presented by the Department of Agriculture, particularly in the field of the rancher. Ten years ago, we were engaged in all phases of ranch development, and we completed approximately ninety (90) percent of the rancher's engineer work. Today, however, we are limited to only the largest ranchers and probably do only five (5) percent of the engineering done for these ranchers.

If there were not, however, many, many competent soils engineers in this country of ours, this bill possibly would be beneficial. But since these engineers exist, this bill is not beneficial and as we feel, just another step to a fully socialistic state.

We urge you to vote against this measure and help defeat this bill.

Very truly yours,

DAVID MILLARD, *Vice-President.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank you for this opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit, and would be happy to answer any questions members of the subcommittee may have.

And may I add that Mr. Klingebiel of the soil survey staff is available here to help with any technical questions that might be asked.

Mr. POAGE. It just occurred to me that we ought to ask what progress the Department of the Interior is making in conducting a basic topographic survey of the United States.

You cannot make a soil survey without that topographic survey, can you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, Mr. Chairman; we can make them without that, through the use of aerial photographs. However, the topographic surveys are extremely helpful in terms of facilitating the mapping endeavor.

I would make this additional comment, that in a sense soil surveys of a large area serve somewhat the same purpose as a topographic survey serves, for assisting in engineering purposes; in other words, it helps to delineate or locate the favorable sites, but it does not help specifically for a given acre of ground just exactly what the topography is.

Mr. POAGE. A geological map, of course, would give more of that soil information than a topographic survey.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Exactly.

Mr. POAGE. But you cannot make a geological map without a topographical map?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The geological map almost has to accompany the topographic map for full meaning. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer your question specifically on the progress of the geologic and topographic mapping. We could get that information for the record.

Mr. POAGE. They are a long ways from having completed the mapping of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And they are not moving at any greater rate than they were many years ago, as I understand it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not sure about that topographic rate. I can tell you with respect to the soil survey mapping, that in the past few years the rate has been stepped up somewhat. This is particularly true in the rural areas where farming is concerned.

In the fiscal year 1966, as near as we have the figures at the present time, soils were mapped in the United States by the Soil Conservation Service and its cooperators of, approximately, 57 million acres of land. Somewhere around one-half of the land area of the United States now has soil maps of some kind, but not all of them have been published. About 60 percent of the commercial farming area in the United States now has been mapped.

The big problem, as we are discussing it here today, in connection with these bills has to do with the increased demand in the urban fringe areas of expansion, and from the many requests we have been receiving from such organizations as State highway departments and others to help in the location and with certain construction specifications of highway building. For example, New Jersey recently participated with us in obtaining some stepped-up soil survey work specifically related to highway locations, to avoid certain desirable



agricultural land and also to help maintain construction costs at a lower level.

Mr. POAGE. You suggested before Mr. Philbin came in, as to the Senate bill, why you prefer the passage of the Senate bill. Will you tell us why?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is our belief that the Senate bill, that is, the wording of it, tends to clarify somewhat more than the wording of the previous bills of which the Philbin bill is one. The real intent and need here and one that should be particularly stressed is the need for a policy to encourage financial participation by local units of government, such as counties, States, and so forth. We think this would be helpful.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I apologize for being late, but as you know we had an executive session of another subcommittee of which I am a member.

I note, Mr. Williams, that at the top of page 6 of your statement you suggest an amendment which would delete the word "full" and add these words:

The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works.

I think that I approve of that amendment.

I want to ask, if you will, as a matter of legislative history here, tell us just what it is intended to accomplish.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I regret that just before you came in, I pointed out just prior to that amendment that this amendment was going to be proposed, not by the Department of Agriculture but by the Consulting Engineers Council.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I see. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We do not consider that this amendment is necessary, but if the committee decides that it is a good thing to do, we have no objection to it.

I wanted to make that point clear.

The soil survey work in the United States, historically, has been of major assistance, just as topographic mapping has been, to the engineering fraternity.

Being an engineer myself in background, I know that this is a very real need. And there is nothing about this proposed legislation that will change our past procedures of making soil surveys that would, in any sense, interfere with the engineering use of it but will facilitate it. And we think that you will find that, later on in the testimony, the Consulting Engineers Council will likely support the bill if such an amendment is included.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Then, if I understand you correctly, you say that it is not contemplated that the Soil Conservation Service would be competing with private engineers?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir, it is not contemplated that it will. In fact, we think, contrary to that, that the work will greatly facilitate the work of the private engineers.

I would like to point this out, Mr. Congressman, that while there undoubtedly have been some cases here and there where there

could have been some degree of question about some of the work we have done, as to whether or not it did conflict or compete with private engineers, but you have to understand in context the nature of our work. Basically, the great bulk of our work, as this committee knows, has to do with working with individual landowners, and not projects, on small types of work such as terracing, grass waterways, small farm ponds, and so on. We have not been able to find any consulting engineering firms in the country interested in going out on the individual farm and doing that kind of work because of the nature of it and because of the fact that the cost to them would be greater in providing that kind of a service, generally speaking, than the cost of the pond. So the private engineers have not been interested in that type of work particularly.

Now, conversely to that, there are many conservation problems of a community nature that we call them group facility type of jobs, in which many farmers or landowners might go together and there would be some significant engineering work involved. In these kinds of cases, it is our policy to urge the local organizations to seek the services of private engineers. I am sure that we have created far more work for private engineers than the few instances, in which there may have been some question about it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you very much.

I have one or two more questions.

On page 3 of S. 902, the term "cooperative arrangement." What is your interpretation of what this might mean?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Throughout the history of the soil survey work, the basic cooperative relationship has been between the State agricultural experiment stations and the Soil Conservation Service. There have been no grants by the Federal Government to the State experiment stations for this work, but through financial resources available to the States, nearly all of the State agricultural experiment stations have participated in some degree in facilitating the work. It is true that that participation may not total over 10 to 15 percent of the amount that the Federal Government is putting into it. This is one type of cooperative arrangement.

Another type, such as that I mentioned a few minutes ago, is that of the State highway department in New Jersey participating with us in obtaining some stepped-up soil survey information for their highway purposes, in which they had to pay a part of the cost of it.

Another example is in southeastern Wisconsin where the governing bodies of the several counties there, as well as the State government, have entered into an agreement with our Service to step up the rate of mapping beyond what we would normally be able to do with our own facilities, in order to complete the mapping of that area, generally, between Chicago and Milwaukee, down to the Illinois line, so that the county-governing bodies could use that information as a tool in helping with general county zoning and things of that kind.

The Soil Conservation Service would have nothing to do with the zoning part, but the county governing bodies would use the information.

In this case, I do not recall the exact amount of the financial contribution that the counties and the State put into it, but it was significant, in order to step up the rate of mapping. These are examples.



Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you very much.

This is, indeed, helpful.

Can you give me any estimate of how much additional money in the way of appropriations might be needed to take care of the activities which would be authorized under S. 902?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I indicated in my testimony, we do not consider that the enactment of this bill in itself would make any appreciable difference in the Federal contribution, because the appropriations that we now receive for soil survey work are included in the conservation operations item under the appropriations bill and in which soil survey is one of the parts of that activity.

Assuming that the rate of progress would be enlarged, even if it is stepped up in contributions from non-Federal resources, we think that this legislation itself will not add to the total cost of the soil survey job.

Now, if there is a step-up of the rate in high-priority areas, it may be necessary for us to seek some additional appropriations because of the stepped-up rate through the regular appropriations process, and not because of this legislation per se.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I understand. Thank you very much. That has been very helpful.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Gathings?

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Williams, you make the statement that huge losses by public and private people had ensued as the result of not having these soil surveys made properly and in time. Are you familiar with what is going on in northern Virginia, in Fairfax, with respect to this?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am, Mr. Gathings. Fairfax happens to be one of the pilot counties in the United States.

Several years ago, we agreed with the State of Virginia and with the county on this program. Here was a problem of mushrooming suburbia. There were tremendous problems faced by the county board of supervisors of that county, in terms of the location of the roads, the question of whether they would approve developers moving into certain areas, putting in septic tanks, and things of that kind.

As the result of that, we entered into a financial agreement with Fairfax County several years ago to step up the rate of the mapping of Fairfax County. That was done; the job was completed. And then some special interpretation maps were made by the county officials in consultation with our service that were helpful to them for zoning purposes and various other things.

I would like to ask, Mr. Gathings, that Mr. Klingebiel, who is more intimately acquainted with the technical part of that, just add a few words to what I have said, if he may?

Mr. GATHINGS. If you would, please comment—yes.

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. I brought along a number of maps to express the use of the soil surveys.

This map is a standard kind of soil survey that we make all over the United States, the kind we made in Fairfax County, Va., and in other States.

Each of these symbols and lines show the different kinds of soils on this map, including slope and erosion. And through the use of this map, by knowing the kind of soil here and being acquainted with the characteristics of that soil, if this soil should occur in another

county or in another State, we can predict and project the kind of information and experience that we had here to some other county or State having the same kind of soil. This is one of the key helps of a soil map.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is that information made available to builders or developers?

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. This information is made available to the public through the standard published soil survey that we make of each of these areas. We have such a report for Fairfax County, Va. This published soil survey contains the basic soil maps in the back of the report, and in addition the kind of interpretations needed, such as the presence of a water table, the shrink-swell potential of the soil, and many other things that influence the use of the soil.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Williams indicated that the surveys only extended in depth 5 feet.

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. That is correct.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is that adequate?

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. This is not adequate for on-site determination for specific construction. This merely provides a clue or a flag. For example, this interpretive map is the same as the original soil map I showed you but one that shows the degree of wetness or the amount of water that you may have in the soil or on the soil. This information, you see, in these red areas on the map indicates that these have severe limitations, insofar as wetness is concerned. So, it flags the problem for the developer, the engineer, the planner, and others. Where they see the red color, they know that they are going to have this kind of a problem. An engineer in his design and in his construction can either avoid these areas or he can design and plan for them.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you know where the springs are located?

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. These features of the landscape including the streams and surface springs are shown on soil maps. But if you are speaking of a spring that causes the water table, the maps will show you where the soils are wet within the 5-foot depth, but not deeper than that.

In other words, the information on the soil map is very useful and helpful to engineers, developers, planners, and others to a depth of 5 feet.

If you are in an area, such as in western Iowa, in the deep loess soils, where you know that the same soil material extends to a depth of 30 to 40 feet or more and that it is all the same kind of material, it is obvious that you could predict the soil behavior down to a greater depth for that kind of soil. Normally, soil survey information applies only to a 5-foot depth.

Mr. GATHINGS. In Fairfax County, there is quite a lot of rolling land—

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. And ravines, and hillsides.

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. Yes, these maps show these features. They show the steepness of the slope and the kind of soil, and the depth of the rock, that is, if rock occurs within the 5-foot depth.

Mr. GATHINGS. But there have been a lot of losses over there as the result of the soil condition, such as a house breaking in two.

Mr. KLINGEBIEL. That is correct. I have seen them.



As a matter of fact, we have used the example from Fairfax County, of the schoolhouse where a quarter-million dollars was saved as a result of the soil map by merely locating the school on more suitable soil at the same site.

This is the same soil map again, but interpreted to show shrink-soil potential. The reasons that caused the building to crack in this picture is that the soil had poor bearing qualities.

The red areas on the map are those areas that have a high shrink-swell—a high clay content of the kind that when it dries out it shrinks and when wet it swells.

Again, this gives a flag in these areas to people wanting this kind of information.

In the yellow areas on the map there is a moderate soil limitation for shrink-swell.

This, again, applies merely to the upper 5-foot depth. For information at greater depths, it would require additional borings.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Gathings.

Mr. Callan?

Mr. CALLAN. Do you have a soil survey going on now for remapping all of the counties in the country?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; not remapping, Mr. Callan. The soil survey is in progress in the United States on a priority basis by counties. The only remapping that is being done is where there were some soil surveys made many, many years ago in which not nearly as much was known at that time about the soil as is now known. We know about 70,000 different kinds of soils in the United States, and the research and the experience of the last several years has pointed up some rather sharp differences in certain kinds of soil that we did not know about many years ago.

Where the maps are real old and not usable, we are doing some remapping; but the rate of mapping, as indicated earlier, is at the rate that we have about 60 percent of the commercial farmland in the United States now mapped in usable mapping, and we are proceeding at the rate of about 57 million acres a year at the present time. Even at that rate, while it has taken care, very largely, of the farming and rural interests, it has not taken care of some of the other interests that we mentioned earlier.

The Fairfax County thing, for example, that was mentioned was not of a very high priority, from strictly an agricultural point of view, but, from the point of view of the general interest of the area in putting the investment of the county, State, and Federal Governments, and private individuals, and so forth, into it, it was highly important and of high priority. We did not feel that we should pull our resources away from the farming communities to go in and step up that mapping. So, we told the county that, "if you will find resources, that is, financial resources, to put in extra help that the survey may be stepped up, then we will be glad to cooperate with you." This is what was done.

Mr. CALLAN. Will this program interfere with our rural areas that need to be mapped?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, this bill in itself would not do that. It merely clarifies the authority that we have.

May I add, Mr. Callan, one of the needs for this clarification?



Even though the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture says that we have the legal authority now to do mapping in such places as Fairfax County, from time to time there have been questions raised in the appropriations committees, and otherwise, with respect to whether or not we really have the authority to serve the non-agricultural type of interests. We think that this will clarify that authority, and we also think it will encourage the participation, such as that in Fairfax County, that we have described.

Mr. CALLAN. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Callan.

Are there any further questions?

If not, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Williams.

It has been an interesting discussion of this matter.

We have six other witnesses listed here. We want to give each witness the same time that we have devoted to Mr. Williams. I think his time has been well spent. My only suggestion is that you will use the minimal time possible to complete your statement so that we may complete this hearing today.

Mr. Philbin, the author of H.R. 2067, is with us.

He has been before us before. We are delighted to have you here, Congressman Philbin, and we will be glad to hear from you now.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Mr. PHILBIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a great honor and pleasure and privilege for me to come here this morning to speak to you very briefly about these pending bills.

I must apologize for not being here on time, but I had to leave a rather important meeting of my own committee to which I will have to return. In any event, I deeply appreciate the opportunity that you have given me to be heard again on these bills, in which I am so deeply interested.

As I sat here and listened to the excellent testimony that was given by the previous witness, I thought that practically all of the points that I might express here this morning had been pretty well covered.

In addition, I recognize the expertise that this great committee enjoys and possesses in this area, and in every other area that pertains to the great work that this great committee is conducting, so that I will be very, very brief.

As you know, gentlemen, this bill merely extends, confirms, and reaffirms the principle and function of the soil survey work of the Department of Agriculture which has been well described by the previous witness.

This program has been under way for some time. The proposal in the bill—the principle of these bills, both my bill and the Senate bill—is not only to reaffirm the authority, but also it will give some new impulse through the progression of the soil surveys, in view of the problems that are developing as the result of the growth of the country and the need for a broad, scientific approach to our soil and conservation problems.

With reference to the expansion of some of the areas of the so-called rural-urban fringe, I think that the bill would definitely expedite—and when I speak of the bill, I am speaking of the Senate bill now

which is entirely agreeable to me, notwithstanding the fact that I introduced H.R. 2076—it will expedite and advance the completion of the soil survey work. Up to this time, as you know, the Department has done some very fine work in these soil surveys, but there is much more that remains to be done now, certainly, in view of the growth and the expansion of the country, and this bill moves in the direction to carry out this vital work.

As you know, the Senate has not only reaffirmed the authority that was provided in my bill, but it also permits cooperative agreements with public agencies desiring soil surveys, as I understand it.

The opposition that has been developed, I think, frankly and candidly, after listening to the testimony of the previous witness, and after consulting and talking with some of the officials of the Department of Agriculture about the matter, it would seem that the fears of the private engineers as heretofore expressed may well be groundless, because I think that, taken as a whole and regarded in proper perspective, it would seem clear that, far short of impairing anyone's business, it would not have that effect—and I feel confident that the committee has no intention of doing that by this legislation. There is no desire to do that, I am sure. On the other hand, the expansion of the soil surveys as projected would perhaps be more helpful to that group. In fact, I am informed very reliably that this would in all likelihood be the case.

As you know, the cost of the proposed soil survey is what might be termed a very moderate one. It is not a lavish program—not expensive, that is, in any real sense, as compared with some of the other outlays that we are making in Government today.

The cost-benefit ratio of this program is very high. It is estimated that the cost-benefit ratio of these surveys is about 100 to 1. And under the circumstances, the benefits from the soil survey more than pay for the survey in about a year's time.

It can be seen, therefore, that these benefits are very substantial, and over a period of time will more than pay for the total cost of the soil surveys, and bring very many benefits to the many communities involved.

There are many savings that are possible under the program for community and for industry and for the average person in the agricultural regions and those that are coming into the agricultural regions as the result of new developments, construction and population expansion that will arise from these programs that would not be uncommon.

I understand that there would be savings from \$38,000 to as much as \$225,000 in individual cases through the use of these soil survey services, such as, for example, in selecting school sites, which is something that has to be done in practically all of our communities these days.

In my own State of Massachusetts, local government officials, planners and engineers, real estate and tax assessors, and dealers, and many others can attest to the savings that have been made possible through the use of soil surveys, because they have been used widely and extensively by all these groups I have mentioned and, perhaps, some others, with greater benefits to the communities in agricultural regions, and in some instances in other adjoining, inter-related regions, and communities. In fact, the savings have ex-



ceeded the cost of making the surveys by many times and that is a matter of record.

We began a program in Massachusetts some time ago to utilize more fully the soil survey service information in the solution of rural areas, and you are familiar with that, and I will not expand on it. I know that you are fully familiar with those problems, what they are, and of what great import and benefit they are to many regions of our country; indeed, there are few congressional areas that would not be impacted by these problems in one way or another.

In one town which is in Congressman Keith's district in the Cape Cod area, they launched a pilot project in this area where the soils were mapped by the Soil Conservation Service and an interpretation was developed for some 10 specific uses including such items as school sites, locations for housing, sewage disposal, agriculture and wildlife, and so forth, and the success of this program was such that detailed soil surveys and interpretations are being made by the Soil Conservation Service on a cost-sharing basis for some 10 to 20 towns.

In addition, the State legislature has passed legislation to assist the communities with their conservation problems, and presently there are over 200 local town and city conservation commissions actively dealing with problems relating to the growth and development of their communities as a result of the soil surveys that have been made, and the assistance they have been able to derive from these surveys in agricultural communities—and, as I said before, in some other communities as well has been very helpful.

So, it seems to me, gentlemen, from the evidence I have—and I think from the evidence that has been presented to this committee—that there are strong reasons for adopting this bill, and I am here most respectfully to urge that course upon you.

If it is a question of inserting some clarifying language that would make a bill acceptable to the group that is objecting, I certainly would not interpose any objections to such a course, but, in any event, I would urge expeditious, favorable action by the committee.

I want to express my deep appreciation for your kindness and consideration in permitting me to come here and to talk to you about this bill. It has been a high privilege to be with you at this hearing this morning.

Mr. POAGE. We thank you very much.

We are very glad to have had you with us.

Are there any questions?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. As I understand you, Mr. Philbin, while you may not think it necessary, you would not have objection to the committee adopting the amendment which has been suggested by the Consulting Engineer Council; that is, that the new activity shall not interfere with engineering services by private engineering firms, et cetera?

Mr. PHILBIN. I have not had a chance to study that amendment, but the way that you have recited it to me, substantially, it would seem to me that I would have no objection to it. I would leave it to the good judgment and the well-known common sense and skill and expertise of this fine committee as to just how that matter should be handled.

Thank you very much.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. If there are no further questions, I will now call on Mr. Eugene B. Waggoner, president, Consulting Engineers Council of the U.S.A.

**STATEMENT OF EUGENE B. WAGGONER, PRESIDENT, CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL OF THE U.S.A.**

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the members of the Consulting Engineers Council of the United States greatly appreciate this opportunity to express to you their concern over possible misinterpretation of the intent and purposes of S. 902 and related bills.

My name is Eugene B. Waggoner. I am executive vice president in charge of the Denver, Colo., office of the consulting engineering firm of Woodward, Clyde, Sherard & Associates. I might mention this firm is engaged in the practice of soil and foundation engineering.

I appear here today as president of Consulting Engineers Council of the United States, a nonprofit organization of approximately 1,800 private firms, representing more than 25,000 engineers and engineering technicians engaged in virtually every field of engineering practice.

Consulting engineers serve the public. Their clients include States, political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, towns, cities, planning boards and commissions, community development districts, large industries, private citizens, and other professionals. Like all private businessmen, consulting engineers rely upon their knowledge, skill, experience, integrity, and service to enable them to successfully compete in the engineering marketplace.

Included in our membership are over 250 firms who provide highly specialized services in the field of soils engineering. There are additionally hundreds of firms whose civil engineering works require knowledge and expertise closely related to the fields of soils and foundations. These firms have invested large sums of money in equipment and technical training. They maintain staffs of recognized experts in soils engineering. Typical projects include soil and foundation engineering for buildings, highways, airfields, dams, powerplants, water and sewage systems, bridges, drainage projects, reservoirs, and subdivision development. Many provide services worldwide.

Adoption of S. 902, as presently worded, will not only permit but may even obligate the Secretary of Agriculture to provide expanded and detailed engineering services in unjustifiable competition with this important segment of the private enterprise community.

Our council is not opposed to the intent of this legislation as explained to us by the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service. And I might say, as others have indicated, in my testimony that generalized agricultural soil surveys, prepared by the Soil Conservation Service, have resulted in soils maps and related information of value to farmers, agriculturists, and, in some instances, to engineers. The preparation and publication of this type of data for urban and nonagricultural areas can be a worthwhile endeavor.

However, the wording of S. 902, as we see it, and, as some Senators interpreted it, implies availability of soil engineering services which extend considerably beyond what we are advised is the primary intent of this legislation. In addition to studies, reports, classification, and



interpretation of soils, S. 902 proposes to make available "technical assistance needed for full use of soil surveys." Such wording might easily be misinterpreted to mean "complete soils engineering as required for a detailed structural foundation," or "all investigations plans and specifications for a complex sewage treatment plant or earth dam." Such services could, as we read the bill, be demanded of the Soil Conservation Service since the Secretary of Agriculture is told in section 2 that he "\* \* \* shall, upon the receipt of a State or other public agency, provide \* \* \* the following assistance \* \* \*".

To most public officials and local commissions, such wording will leave little doubt but what the Department of Agriculture must, if asked, provide full and complete soils engineering for a building, subdivision, park, sewage treatment plant, or other public works project. The possibility of such misinterpretation has already been demonstrated. Senate Agriculture Committee Report No. 1180 states in part:

The same basic principles of soil behavior (as used in traditional soil surveys) are now being used extensively to determine the use of soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreation facilities \* \* \*. Enactment of this bill would provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities.

Also, when this measure came before the Senate on May 23, 1966, testimony was offered to the effect that:

Using the soil survey, industry finds the proper place to build, homeowners and builders locate the best place for houses and septic tanks, and counties and municipalities chose the proper site for reservoirs, highways, pipelines, and sewage systems.

Soil surveys are, of course, often useful in determining general sites, but it is totally absurd to consider either alternate or specific locations for any industrial plant, highway, pipeline, or other major public works projects without detailed soils and foundation analyses and engineering.

To assume that general soil surveys are suitable for engineering design use—as has already been done—is not only a distortion of the scope of services intended by S. 902 to be available from the Department of Agriculture, but, in some instances, could result in expensive and serious consequences.

The files of Consulting Engineers Council already contain documented reports of projects wherein Soil Conservation Service engineers, under present legislation and authority, have provided complete engineering services to private clients in direct competition with consulting engineers. These situations are past history. We are here today to seek means of avoiding such occurrences in the future. And we respectfully suggest that the best means of accomplishing this is through delineation of the intent of Congress in the actual wording of the authorizing legislation.

In this respect, we believe that modification of the provision of "technical assistance needed for full use of soil surveys" would be in the best interest of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the consulting engineering profession. We have, accordingly, held a number of meetings with officials of the Soil Conservation Service and, as a result of these meetings, have agreed upon the desirability of the following amendment:

Amend section 2, subparagraph 3, by deleting the word "full" from the sentence and by inserting at the end of section 2 the following new paragraph:

The provision, by the Secretary, of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works.

Let me specifically state that it is our intent that this amendment not be inserted as another (fifth) subparagraph, but rather that it be a new, additional paragraph binding upon all elements of section 2.

By eliminating the word "full" from subparagraph 3, we would hope to avoid any implication that the Secretary shall be required to provide complete and detailed soils engineering assistance. By adding the suggested additional paragraph to section 2, we hope to preclude misinterpretation of this legislation as authorization or responsibility to engage in engineering services over and above the generalized soil surveys and maps now being provided by the Soil Conservation Service.

We believe that the language we recommend is consistent with the Bureau of the Budget's procurement directive, Circular No. A-76, which "reaffirms the Government's basic policy of relying upon the private enterprise system to supply its needs." Our proposed amendment has the approval of the Administrator of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service. We hope you will agree that our recommendation is in the public interest.

Consulting engineers have no subsidies and they seek none. All that our members are asking, in calling this matter to your attention, is your help to be sure a proper climate for the continued private practice of consulting engineering. As such, we respectfully urge your favorable consideration of S. 902 only so long as it contains the aforementioned amendment.

We thank you for this opportunity to express our views and recommendations relative to this important legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much. We appreciate your statement, Mr. Waggoner.

Are there any questions?

If there are none, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Waggoner.

Mr. WAGGONER. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We will now call on our colleague, Mr. Dow. He wants to make a statement.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN G. DOW, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Dow. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure I am speaking on something germane to your topic here. I am here in reference to Congressman Philbin's bill, H.R. 2076, and my own, H.R. 13552.

Mr. POAGE. Yours is the same bill?

Mr. Dow. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Philbin testified on his.

Mr. Dow. If you will permit me, sir, I would like to enter a statement in regard to my bill.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly, we would like to have you do so.

Mr. Dow. I do not want to upset the schedule, but I appreciate this opportunity to testify.



Allow me to thank you for the chance to appear before you today in support of the bill that I have introduced to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural areas, and for other purposes.

The bill is identical to H.R. 2076, which was introduced by our colleague, Representative Philbin.

My purpose in appearing as a cosponsor for this legislation relates to the rapidly growing suburban area that I represent in Rockland and Orange Counties of New York State. The rate of growth is so rapid that mistakes are being made in such obvious sites as highway locations, zoning, and scenic preservation. What mistakes are being made in the much less apparent selection of uses for soil is anybody's guess, and is undoubtedly a dismal abuse of vast amounts of good land.

It does not take much imagination to envisage blacktop laid on rich loam. In many suburban areas leaching fields are laid out in clay or rock-filled soil beyond the potential for absorption. Before our eyes land is denuded of topsoil and peat. In suburban planning there is little regard of the special usefulness of land for particular crops.

In flying over our eastern countryside we can see countless cases of trees and grass cover being stripped from embankments that are exposed by housing developments and highway excavations. Land that maintains unusual stands of native trees and shrubbery is gored without regard for its natural potential.

Besides the long-term abuse of these critical resources there are immediate and practical damages as a result of land misuse: water is lost, homes are flooded, basements crack, and soils with poor bearing qualities give way under structures built on ill-chosen sites.

The groundwork of all community planning should be soil analysis. I subscribe to the purposes of these two bills.

Mr. Chairman, I submit in support a copy of a letter dated June 30, 1966, from the Rockland County Planning Board, addressed to me and recommending passage of this legislation.

Kindly accept my thanks for listening to this brief testimony.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. Dow. We are very glad to have you with us. The letter you mentioned will be made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to, dated June 30, 1966, follows:)

ROCKLAND COUNTY PLANNING BOARD,  
New City, N.Y., June 30, 1966.

Hon. JOHN G. Dow,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOW: The Rockland County Planning Board at its June 18th meeting unanimously passed a resolution in support of H.R. 2076, introduced by Representative Philbin, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to facilitate soil surveys and other applicable surveys in urban areas.

This bill, at present, is in the House of Agricultural Committee on which Representative Joseph Resnick, of New York, is a member.

The Rockland County Planning Board would appreciate any effort on your part to expedite moving this bill out of committee and getting it passed.

Thank you for your kind assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

AARON D. FRIED,  
Planning Director.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any questions?

Mr. GATHINGS?

Mr. GATHINGS. Did you hear the testimony of Mr. Waggoner just a minute ago?

Mr. DOW. I am afraid that I did not. I just came in.

Mr. GATHINGS. He suggested an amendment that had to do with the private practice of soil engineering. Would you object to such an amendment being put in here at the end of section 2?

Mr. DOW. Mr. Gathings, I am in favor of the general thrust and purpose of this bill, and I do not have any ax to grind in relation to a particular amendment, except that I would not want to see the effort damaged or slowed up because of something relating to private enterprise.

I am for the employment of private soil engineers where possible, but I would dislike to think that the amendment would throw off the effectiveness of the bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Gathings.

If there are no further questions, we are very much obliged to you.

Mr. DOW. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We have four more witnesses listed on the witness list. Obviously, we will be pressed for time. I cannot speak for the other members of the committee, I am sure, but I think that the committee is inclined to report this bill with the amendment that has been suggested.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to speak for everybody on this side to state that we are for it.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think that there is any opposition.

I thought that there might be witnesses who might want to file their statements, rather than to present them orally.

Anybody who wants to place his full statement in the record, may do so.

We will next call on Mr. G. Reynolds Watkins, chairman, Professional Engineers in Private Practice, Functional Section, National Society of Professional Engineers.

We will be glad to hear from you now.

Mr. WATKINS. I will try to be as brief as possible, sir.

Mr. POAGE. If you care to, you may file your statement and we will make it a part of the record, without you having to read it.

If you want to read it, you may do so.

#### **STATEMENT OF G. REYNOLDS WATKINS, CHAIRMAN, PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS IN PRIVATE PRACTICE, FUNCTIONAL SECTION, THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS**

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to present the views of the National Society of Professional Engineers on S. 902, a bill to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies.

My name is G. Reynolds Watkins. I am a professional engineer from Lexington, Ky., where I have my own consulting engineering firm. I appear here today as chairman of the Professional Engineers in Private Practice, Functional Section of the National Society of



Professional Engineers, a nonprofit organization having a membership of more than 65,000. Our society is composed of professional engineers engaged in virtually all branches of the engineering profession and all fields of professional endeavor. Each of the society's members is qualified under applicable State engineering registration laws which certify that registrants have met the prescribed qualifications for engaging in the practice of professional engineering. The society's membership is affiliated through 53 States and territorial societies and more than 450 local chapters.

We have carefully analyzed S. 902, and are seriously concerned about its potential impact on the engineering profession if it is enacted as presently written.

Section 2 of S. 902, as has been pointed out, specifically directs the Secretary of Agriculture, on request of a State or other public agency, to provide soil survey assistance in connection with areas of rapidly changing uses, including both farms and nonfarm areas. Such assistance would include not only the making and furnishing of soil surveys, but also "the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys."

It is our understanding that S. 902 is not intended to authorize the Department of Agriculture to provide services to States or other public agencies in competition with private engineering firms or consultants. However, nowhere in the bill is there any limitation on such competition. To the contrary, the undefined and highly ambiguous phrase, "technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys" without modification or restriction could easily and reasonably be interpreted to include many of the professional engineering services now provided by private engineering firms and consultants in connection with soils engineering activities.

We have discussed this serious problem of ambiguity in the bill with officials of the Soil Conservation Service, and it is our understanding that in proposing this legislation the Department of Agriculture did not contemplate the creation of any problem of competition.

The position of the Soil Conservation Service is set forth in a letter to our society, dated June 30, 1966, from Mr. Donald A. Williams, the Administrator. Mr. Williams' letter states, in effect, that no competition or duplication of the services of engineers in private practice is intended by the bill. With the permission of the subcommittee, we submit a copy of this letter for inclusion in the record as part of our testimony.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, the letter will be made a part of the record at the conclusion of your statement.

Mr. WATKINS. We understand further from our conversations with officials of the Soil Conservation Service that the agency would have no objection to inclusion of language in the bill making it clear that competition with private engineering firms or consultants is not intended. On this basis, we respectfully offer for the subcommittee's consideration a proposed amendment which we believe would simply and effectively accomplish this, yet in no way hinder or hamper either the bill's stated purposes or the effectiveness of the Department of Agriculture's soil survey program.

Our amendment is a little different from the other amendment, and this is why I would like to get it in the record.

We recommend that there be added at the end of Section 2 the following paragraph:

In providing such assistance, the Secretary shall not provide any service that is readily available from private engineering firms or consultants.

This language is patterned closely after an amendment to the State Technical Services Act of 1965, approved last year by both the House and the Senate after consideration of the same basic problem now raised by S. 902. The amendment's purpose there was to avoid any unintended competition with private firms or consultants in providing "technical services" or "technical assistance" under the act to State, local, or regional groups. We have observed the operation of the State Technical Services Act closely since its enactment, and know of no particular difficulties in the interpretation or application of this amendment, either for the administering Federal agency, the State and local groups involved, or the engineering profession.

We strongly urge that this same type of amendment be adopted in the present case.

Mr. Chairman, we greatly appreciate this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to present our views on this important matter, and will be happy to answer any questions or provide any additional information you may desire.

(The letter presented by Mr. Watkins, dated June 20, 1966, follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1966.

Mr. WILLIAM D. PATTON,  
*Legislative Counsel, National Society of Professional Engineers,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PATTON: Reference is made to your telephone conversation of June 29, 1966, with Mr. Warren A. Blight relative to the provisions of S. 902. You asked that we send a letter explaining the need for S. 902 and the interpretation of "technical services" as noted in the bill in relation to those services performed by private engineers.

Your question centered around the interpretation of the words "technical services" as used in the bill. Generally, we consider these "technical services" to include the field mapping work, and soil interpretation and classification that is necessary to accompany a soil survey. It is not intended that such "technical services" would include the taking and testing of samples that would be necessary for construction purposes. The problem seems to be one of interpretation of words. We see no problem of competition or duplication of effort in this area.

Recently we were in conference with the staff of the Consulting Engineering Council discussing the provisions of S. 902. When this group understood the interpretation placed on the wording in S. 902, they voiced their support in favor of the bill.

Soil surveys as completed by the Department of Agriculture and interpretations thereof, could be highly beneficial to those people doing soil testing work or engaged in construction engineering. Soil surveys show the location and extent of the different kinds of soil. They provide information about soil properties to the depth of about six feet and in some instances, predictions about soil behavior can be made to ten or more feet in depth. These soil maps properly interpreted are a valuable guide to engineers regarding the kinds of problems they may expect such as wetness, rock, low-bearing strength, shrink-swell potential, and the like. Through the use of soil surveys, engineers can make more accurate estimates on construction costs and avoid many problems that might otherwise be encountered. The surveys also help them to determine the location and spacing of samples to be analyzed in the laboratory and the area under which the data can be applied.

Soil maps are not designed or intended to be used in lieu of on-site evaluation or sampling for specific construction sites. They are meant to complement not duplicate the work of the engineers. We have had numerous compliments from engineering firms on how beneficial they find soil surveys in carrying out their work.



We are enclosing a booklet "Know Your Soil" which explains the development of a soil survey and how soil surveys are used to assist private engineers, foresters, and the like.

We hope this information will be helpful to you. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. WILLIAMS, *Administrator.*

Mr. WATKINS. In addition to the essence of our prepared statement, I would like to make two very brief comments, if I may sir.

Mr. POAGE. Proceed.

Mr. WATKINS. No. 1 is that we certainly welcome Mr. Williams' statement that the services covered by this legislation will not be provided in competition with private practice. We appreciate his sympathetic response to our problem. However, we want to point out that we cannot agree with his conclusion that no amendment is needed. That is the first point which I want to make.

The second point is that, although admittedly the engineers in private practice are much more interested in the soils work that goes along with construction projects, still there are certain firms and certain of our members who also engage in overall soils work.

The third point is: We feel that the amendment we propose is perhaps briefer, clearer, simpler, and less subject to misinterpretation than the amendment which has been proposed in the other testimony.

For this reason, we respectfully request that the wording which we have proposed here be given your very serious consideration.

We greatly appreciate having been given the opportunity to present this statement. We understand your time problem. Unless there are questions, we will close our testimony.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you very much, Mr. Watkins. Mr. Dole.

Mr. DOLE. Briefly, what effect would this have that the other proposed amendment would not have?

Mr. WATKINS. We simply think, sir, that the simplicity of our language is less subject to being misinterpreted. The word "interfere" bothers us somewhat, to be very frank about it, and we think that the same language that went along with the State Technical Services Act is clearer and simpler language.

Mr. DOLE. You think either amendment would be an improvement to the bill, if we adopt one or the other?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLE. In other words, there is some merit not only to your amendment but to the other amendment?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Watkins.

Mr. WATKINS. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. We will now call on Mr. Gardner M. Reynolds, director, district 1, American Society of Civil Engineers.

#### STATEMENT OF GARDNER M. REYNOLDS, DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 1, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee. I have listened to your discussion regarding time, and I would be willing to file my statement. It is a very brief one, but outlines the position of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, we will include your statement in the record, in full.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would like to include, sir, a statement which I have not included in my written statement, to the effect that the American Society of Civil Engineers would endorse either of the amendments that have been proposed here today, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, sir.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Reynolds reads in full as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GARDNER M. REYNOLDS, DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 1, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

I am appearing before you as a representative of the American Society of Civil Engineers, a National engineering organization of some 60,000 members, to discuss the implications in a bill passed by the Senate—S. 902—wherein the Department of Agriculture is “to make available soil surveys needed by states and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and *for other purposes.*” The underlining on the written copy has been added by me.

Our Society is concerned that the enactment of this bill into law will encourage the Department of Agriculture to provide engineering services which are now being furnished competently by private consulting engineering firms. It is our opinion that the provision of these services by an agency of the Federal Government would not be in the best interests of the public.

In March 1960, the American Society of Civil Engineers adopted a “Policy Regarding the Relationship Between Public and Private Engineering in Governmental Agencies.” A portion of this Policy, which is applicable to the situation under discussion, is as follows:

“... The Society’s 44,000 members include more than 13,000 professional engineers in the service of all levels of government, and at least 9,500 engineers engaged as principals or employees in the private practice of engineering. With primary regard for the public welfare, and in the professional interest of these segments of membership, it is incumbent upon the Society to recommend a policy that will insure the most efficient and economical use of all engineering services . . .”

There are hundreds of private engineering firms in the country who perform foundation investigations and develop criteria for the foundation support of structures, the development of unused land, the evaluation of landslide potentials, the installation of underground facilities and other engineered works. It is our opinion that S. 902, as written, will allow the Department of Agriculture to furnish these services with a resultant weakening of a much needed private segment of the economy.

It is recognized that the soil surveys that have been performed by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture are extremely valuable to engineers in planning engineering works in areas where such surveys are available. However, they do not preclude the need for detailed subsurface investigations to obtain data for foundation design for such engineering works. The data in the present soil surveys are limited to the upper few feet of soil.

We are concerned that under the authority of S. 902 the Department of Agriculture will undertake detailed subsurface investigations and provide soil data that will be used in engineering design.

It is requested that S. 902 be amended to limit the Department of Agriculture to the type of service now provided and to insure that the Department will not expand their services into an area that is being adequately served by private practice.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any questions of Mr. Reynolds?

If not, we are very much obliged to you.

We will next call Mr. Robert E. Graf, chairman, Rural-Urban Affairs Committee of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.



## STATEMENT OF ROBERT E. GRAF, CHAIRMAN, RURAL-URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. GRAF. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I will be very pleased to file our statement with you.

Mr. POAGE. Without objection, your statement may be filed and placed in the record at this point.

Mr. GRAF. We have no objection to either of the amendments. Thank you.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Graf reads in full as follows:)

### STATEMENT BY ROBERT E. GRAF, CHAIRMAN, RURAL-URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

I am Robert E. Graf, Chairman of the Rural-Urban Affairs Committee of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (NACD). Our Association represents the 3,000 Conservation Districts organized under state law throughout the United States, and their Associations in the 50 States and Puerto Rico.

NACD enthusiastically recommends the enactment of S. 902 passed by the Senate which clarifies the authority of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to conduct soil surveys and provide soils information in non-agricultural areas. We believe that this legislation will enable the U.S. Soil Conservation Service more adequately to assist Soil and Water Conservation Districts in providing needed and useful services in conservation and resource development.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey has proven to be one of the most valuable tools for achieving wise land, water, and other resource use in the United States. Over the past three decades, it has found its principal application in defining areas of farm lands in most urgent need of conservation treatment, and in contributing to the design of engineering and agronomic practices most effective in halting soil erosion and other kinds of resource deterioration.

In recent years, however, the patterns of land use throughout the country—and the potential uses of soil surveys—have been changing. Cities and towns have pushed through their original boundaries, spreading over into adjacent farm and forest lands. Large new recreational areas have been established for the benefit of our growing population. A great network of interstate highways is criss-crossing the countryside. New electric transmission lines, pipe lines, and water distribution facilities are linking production areas with consuming areas.

Residential areas, business districts, and farm lands are no longer confined as clearly as they once were to distinct and separate regions. Today, they are being mixed—one with the other, and the mixture often extends considerable distances into rural areas.

These new patterns of land use have created problems of many kinds. Some of these are related to the past failure of planners, developers, and builders to utilize knowledge about the characteristics of soils and other resource factors in areas under consideration for new or additional uses. Often the information has simply not been available. This has led to the construction of homes whose septic tanks would not function, whose basements flood after rainstorms, and whose foundations crack and crumble.

It has led to road-building practices which accelerate erosion and block farm drainage systems, and to the selection of routes for utility rights-of-way which are unduly expensive and which damage nearby resources. It has also led to the unwise diversion of fertile agricultural lands to other purposes; to the pollution of streams, lakes, and reservoirs by sediment washed from construction areas; and to the waste of water development, recreational, and open space sites having great potential value.

These problems are apparent and most dramatic in the vicinity of our larger urban centers where the pressures behind metropolitan sprawl are most intense. Where they occur, to varying degrees, in a great many other parts of the nation. Wherever there is a growing community, there is usually a risk of unwise land use and unplanned resource development. Wherever a pipeline, a dam, or a highway

is under construction, the risks are present. The cost in dollars, in resource damage, and in human effort is very large.

Soil and Water Conservation Districts—drawing upon the aid of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other federal and state agencies cooperating with them—are seeking ways to reduce resource waste and damage from these causes—and to contribute to wiser and more efficient land planning and development.

District leaders have learned that the soil survey, accompanied with proper interpretations, can be as valuable in solving some of the complex resource-use problems in non-farm rural areas, and in rural-urban fringe areas, as it has been—and will continue to be—in meeting conservation problems on farm and ranch lands. They have discovered that community planning boards and commissions—ranging from the small planning agencies in our New England towns to the large regional planning bodies serving the big cities—are eager to get reliable soils information as a basis for community planning.

Soils data, properly interpreted, can help identify areas most suitable for residential, commercial, recreational and agricultural use. Soil surveys can help determine the least expensive and most desirable places to construct schools, highways, and utility lines. They can help locate potential open space areas, potential water supply sites, and prime park and wildlife areas. They can serve as the foundation for sediment pollution control programs, for reducing erosion along highway and utility routes, and even for the landscaping plans for public buildings.

In numerous cases, the cost of soil survey reports has been recaptured by use of the information in connection with a single decision. As an example, one town in Massachusetts was ready to call a special town meeting to appropriate funds for the purchase of a school site. Percolation tests had yielded favorable results. However, on checking their recently completed soil survey, it was found that soil scientists had rated the site as severely limited for schools. Further field investigation showed unforeseen water problems at the site which had not been obvious during the percolation tests. Consequently, the town went on to look for a more favorable site and saved the money which might have been used to purchase the undesirable site.

The need to accelerate the rate of soil surveying and to extend the use of land inventories beyond the boundaries of farms and ranches has long been recognized by Conservation Districts. It has become even more apparent during the past several years as over two-thirds of the Districts have formulated more far-reaching long-range programs of farm, water, forest, and recreational development. Acceleration and wider use of soils information is given high priority in a large proportion of these long-range programs.

At the 20th annual convention of our National Association held this year in New Orleans, the NACD Council—representing 3,000 Districts and their State Associations—urged the expansion of soil surveys and specifically endorsed the principle of S. 902. Our association policy states:

“This measure has many desirable features important to the planning and future development of natural resources in many rapidly-changing fringe areas near metropolitan centers. In many such areas, farm lands are being used for urban and suburban development. All too often, such expansions do not take into account the application of the sciences and techniques to achieve soil, water, and other natural resource conservation.”

Our association is happy to support S. 902. We earnestly recommend its adoption. We appreciate this opportunity to present our views before your Subcommittee.

Mr. POAGE. Are there any questions?

Mr. GATHINGS. I would like to ask Mr. Graf a question.

Did you appear before the Senate committee when this bill was before that body?

Mr. GRAF. No, I did not myself.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Williams, what was the consideration that was given this legislation in the Senate, do you recall?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I recall it, Mr. Gathings, essentially no issue was raised with respect to this engineering problem. The wording of S. 902 is essentially that recommended by the administration. I think the question with respect to the interpretation arose subsequent



to the Senate passage and subsequent to any testimony that was given there. It is my belief that the Senate would not object to the amendment if this committee saw fit to include it. I am not sure of that, but I think that would be the case.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Gathings.

If there are no further questions, we will call, next, Mr. George H. Nelson, president, Law Engineering Testing Co., Atlanta, Ga.

We will be glad to hear from you now, Mr. Nelson.

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE H. NELSON, PRESIDENT, LAW ENGINEERING TESTING CO., ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. We would like to file our statement, in view of the testimony we have already heard this morning, and the time factor involved in the presenting of it.

Mr. POAGE. Your statement will be included and made a part of the record at this point.

We thank you very much.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Nelson reads in full as follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE H. NELSON, PRESIDENT-ELECT, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT LABORATORIES, INC.

My name is George H. Nelson and I am President of Law Engineering Testing Company of Atlanta, Georgia, a firm specializing in materials testing, soil and foundation investigations and geological surveys. I am also President-Elect of the American Council of Independent Laboratories, a national professional association of independent, tax-paying laboratories. Approximately 100 of our members practice in the soils testing and foundation engineering field. I am here to state the position of the ACIL regarding Senate Bill 902.

ACIL recognizes the value to the nation of the general soils classifications provided by the National Cooperative Soil Survey. This type of broad gauge activity, similar to the geologic, water supply and topographic mapping services undertaken by the U.S. Geologic Survey are in the highest and most appropriate order of government service. They provide inventory-type information which is needed for overall planning and for utilization of our natural resources. These are programs that, because of their scope and size, could not be undertaken by industry because they cover such large areas of our country and because their objectives are long range and have wide usage.

ACIL supports such activity and depends on the wisdom of Congress to determine the need for such programs at the proper time and when resources are available to finance them.

Senate Bill 902, however, goes beyond this concept in Section 2 in that it expands the scope of this activity into areas of service traditionally provided by private enterprise.

Specifically, this bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide assistance to a state or other public agency in four areas. Item 3, "the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys," particularly is a direct incursion into a field of activity provided by consulting professional geologists and soils engineers. It is the position of ACIL that the services proposed are now available and can be provided by competent, experienced registered professional engineers doing business in every part of the United States. These specialized consultants have, through many years of experience with many types and classes of soils in many geographic areas and in many engineering applications, developed an expertise in problems relating to soils that when applied will provide economic, practical solutions for all types of clients.

On March 3, 1966, Circular No. A-76 was issued by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Bureau of the Budget, the subject being "Policies for acquiring commercial or industrial products and services for government use."



Under 2 of this circular, the stated policy is "The guidelines in this circular are in furtherance of the government's general policy of relying on the private enterprise system to supply its needs."

ACIL believes that it would be in direct conflict with this policy to attempt to develop in an arm of the Federal Government such a staff of consultants to provide the same services that are now available and to do so at the expense of the very firms who provide the tax support for our government.

Walter F. Carey, then President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, said in a talk last year and I quote:

"For, to put it bluntly, the government of this free enterprise nation is—unintentionally, I know—nibbling and sometimes gobbling at the offspring of free enterprise. Government by its size and continuing growth is being demonstrably injurious to our internal competitiveness, to our creativity, to our proven and innate ability for generating goods and services, and—what is of most importance to most people—jobs.

"President Johnson is striving to achieve more economic growth. Get the government out of unnecessary activities and the creativity of scores of individual businesses will increase. Profits will increase. Tax revenues will increase. Jobs will increase. And on the other side—the government side—prudence, thrift, efficiency will increase."

Mr. Carey was not far from the truth.

It is my understanding that an amendment to this bill has been proposed which would read substantially as follows:

"The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works."

To accept this amendment would not be without precedent. As an example, on the recently passed State Technical Services Act, S. 949 and H.R. 3420, certain changes were made which had the effect of eliminating objections such as the above. The original wording was,

"Determined that such technical services program does not provide a service performed as practicably by private technical services, professional consultants or private institutions."

This was changed to read as follows:

"Determined that such technical services program does not provide a service that is now available or could be made available as practicably by private technical services, professional consultants or private institutions."

We are in agreement that this amendment would remove the opposition which we have to this bill and would recommend its acceptance to help assure that this legislation achieves its intended purpose.

Thank you.

(The following letters and statements were also submitted:)

#### STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES KEE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit of the Agriculture Committee of the United States House of Representatives, I am deeply grateful for your courtesy in providing me this opportunity to present this statement for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of your Subcommittee are to be highly commended for holding hearings today on this vital legislation. This proposed legislation is a reasonable and sound approach, which if enacted, will be of benefit to many citizens and areas in the United States.

I enthusiastically support the principles contained in the various proposals receiving your consideration this morning. In fact, I have introduced H.R. 13566 primarily because of the following valid reasons:

1. This measure will promote the use of soil maps as an aid to orderly planning of rural fringe areas.

2. The soil survey assistance which the farmer has received should now be available to the other users of land, which would be authorized under this proposed legislation.

3. Thousands of non-agricultural developments will spring up in all parts of our Nation during the oncoming years in the immediate future. Community leaders must be equipped with this type of legislation in order to have the tools to resolve the numerous existing problems of sedimentation, sanita-

tion, and waste disposal which this will provide. I have been advised that sedimentation from construction activities is one of the major pollutants of water.

4. Home-buyers and rural-fringe developers are losing millions of dollars every year due to poor building sites. This proposed legislation can help to substantially prevent these unnecessary losses.

5. This measure would enable the mobilization of additional needed manpower and would eliminate the present confusion in existing laws under which the Soil Conservation Service is now directed to act.

6. These proposals will strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service.

Especially will H.R. 13566 further accelerate the very important work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in providing soil surveys. We are rapidly becoming an urban society and although my home State of West Virginia is not one of the highly populated sections of the United States, smaller towns are expanding and the larger cities are increasing with new housing developments and industries at an accelerating rate.

It is vitally important to community planners and developers that they have soil surveys and interpretative data available to them for use in making efficient long-range plans and programs. The value of soil surveys for community planning is best expressed as a cost avoidance item. When such data are available, shifts in use can often be planned with the best possible use being made of the soils in the broad planning area. It is my further understanding that hundreds of examples are known where thousands of dollars have been lost annually because of poor site selection for specific uses.

The Soil Conservation Service is now mapping five million acres annually in these rapidly expanding use areas. At this rate of mapping, and considering the rapid population growth across our Nation, many areas will be developed without the advantage of a soil survey and the interpretative information that accompanies such survey.

It appears logical to me that we should restate and clarify the policy of the Department of Agriculture regarding soil surveys in areas of rapidly changing land uses and direct the Secretary to accelerate surveys in such areas in order to keep pace with the needs as we know them to be. It also appears reasonable that we should now avoid the expensive mistakes that have been experienced in the past and provide the needed soil survey data available to planners and developers prior to the development of long-range plans and programs for community development.

In considering the bills before your Subcommittee, I would respectfully encourage the adoption of the revised wording contained in S. 902 as passed by the U.S. Senate. No new authority is needed for the Secretary of Agriculture to make soil surveys. It seems to me the revised wording in S. 902 more clearly states what is needed in the way of a clarification and restatement of authority and encourages the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements for local cost sharing for purposes of making soil surveys in areas of rapidly changing land uses.

As an example of use of soils information for nonfarm uses, the Health Department in my home County of Mercer used soils information to develop a map of the County showing soil limitations for septic tank disposal fields and as a basis for developing specifications for sewage effluent disposal and for sanitary land fill.

In addition, the Soil Conservation Service provided soil interpretations for woodland to the U.S. Steel Corporation on 75,000 acres in McDowell, Wyoming and Mercer Counties, all of which are located in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia.

The Soil Conservation Service furnished soils information for recreation and engineering uses for the development of a recreation plan for one of the watersheds—Brush Creek Recreation Area. A private engineering consulting firm, The Miniaci Engineering Company of Pineville, West Virginia, is cooperating with the Soil Conservation Service in this development.

At the present time, Airways Engineering Corporation is conducting a Feasibility Survey for Mercer County in order to determine whether or not a joint Commercial-Industrial Park and Airport Complex can be established. Such a complex is absolutely essential for the continued economic development of southern West Virginia. The information previously obtained by the Soil Conservation Service is absolutely vital specifically to the engineering feasibility and as such will contribute substantially to the final determination of this Feasibility Survey.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I again express my deep appreciation to you and the Members of your Subcommittee for your consideration of this statement on behalf of this proposed legislation.



STATEMENT OF TONY T. DECHANT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

The National Farmers Union is in full support of the passage of S. 902, a bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by states and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes.

Soil surveys conducted by the Soil Conservation Service traditionally have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, recreation facilities, etc.

Soil maps are needed for non-farm land.

In a great many parts of the country a clear-cut distinction no longer exists between rural and urban living. As modern highways are built many non-farm people establish their homes in rural areas. To achieve good living for both advanced community planning is essential. Such areas have new needs for water management, sewage disposal, schools, recreation areas, and other facilities. Such planning requires accurate knowledge of the soils and their alternative potentials in order to avoid serious losses of investment in construction and maintenance costs. To solve these problems the results of the soil surveys should be available to the planning agencies, the residents, and other public and private agencies.

S. 902 as passed by the United States Senate would clarify and restate soil survey policy for the Department of Agriculture. The National Farmers Union believes the authority proposed is needed because:

1. It will promote the use of soil maps as an aid to orderly planning of rural-fringe areas.

2. The soil survey assistance which farmers have received is needed by other users of land.

3. Thousands of non-agricultural developments will spring up in all parts of the Nation during the next few years. Community leaders must be equipped with soil maps to deal with the numerous problems of sedimentation, sanitation and waste disposal which this will present. Sedimentation from construction activities is one of the major pollutants of water.

4. Home buyers and rural-fringe developers are losing millions of dollars every year due to poor building sites.

5. It will strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service. It will enable the mobilization of additional needed manpower and will clear up the present confusion in the laws under which the Soil Conservation Service is directed to act.

Farmers Union delegates at our 64th annual convention in Denver last March took note of these needs. They voted to call upon Congress to enact legislation to clarify the Department of Agriculture's authority to conduct soil surveys on non-farm land.

Therefore, we urge the enactment of S. 902 by the House of Representatives and request that this letter be made a part of the record of the public hearing on this needed legislation.

---

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., <sup>W</sup>June 28, 1966.

Congressman GERALD R. FORD,  
Minority Leader,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The tax-paying sector of the engineering profession is greatly alarmed over the implications of greatly increased infringement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture into the field of private engineering practice by Senate Bill 902 (and/or H.R. 2076). The basic idea of providing soils surveys is all right, but the language authorizing the work is so broad that it can include planning and design of "such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities and water and sewage facilities," to quote from the Senate Committee reporting out the bill.

Please do what you can to have this wording changed so as to let the Department of Agriculture do the work for which they are trained and organized, and for us to continue to do the work for which we are trained and organized.

Respectfully yours,

KENNETH W. ANDERSON,  
Professional Engineer.



BARR & ASSOCIATES,  
*Kodiak, Alaska, June 30, 1966.*

Representative RALPH RIVERS,  
*U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. RIVERS: This letter is written to protest S.902, a bill which has passed the Senate and is now in the House Agricultural Committee.

S.902 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Soil Conservation Service, to provide soils investigations, surveys and interpretations for states, cities, local planning boards and other public agencies.

S.902 could open the door for expansion of U.S.D.A.'s present soil mapping and surveys to the extent that that agency could shortly be offering services in direct competition with consulting soils engineers, civil engineers and other branches of private consulting engineers through "planning" for such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities and water and sewage facilities.

We in Kodiak have had a very recent experience with government engineering. Recently the Corps of Engineers, (U.S. Government) took over a signed contract from this firm which we had with the Alaska State Housing Authority for the reason that "the Corps would have to lay off some of their key personnel because of lack of work." This firm's staff was cut from sixteen employees back to nine because of this action.

You are urged to actively oppose S.902 or amend it so as to forestall creating of another government agency that can only exist at the expense of private engineering firms.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. BARR.

Mr. POAGE. I believe that concludes all of the witnesses we have listed here.

Is there anyone else here who wants to be heard on this subject?

If not, we are very much obliged to every one of you.

The committee will now go into executive session.

We are very glad to have had you all with us this morning.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the subcommittee retired into executive session.)

○









89TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 902

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1965

MR. ELLENDER (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, result-  
4       ing in the discontinuance of farming operations on large areas  
5       of agricultural land and the consequent serious deterioration  
6       of such agricultural land and other land through erosion by  
7       wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural and other  
8       land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing severe

1 problems concerning needed changes in the use of such land  
2 and the effects of such changes on the protection, develop-  
3 ment, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such  
4 areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal  
5 Government should cooperate with States and other public  
6 agencies for the purpose of providing assistance in planning  
7 for such changes in land use and for the protection, devel-  
8 opment, and utilization of the soil and water resources of  
9 such areas, and thereby assist in preserving and protecting  
10 the Nation's soil and water resources.

11 SEC. 2. In order to cooperate with and assist States  
12 and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation  
13 districts, regional, State, and local planning boards and com-  
14 missions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly  
15 adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly expand-  
16 ing urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas and for  
17 the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and  
18 water resources of such areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is  
19 authorized, upon the request of the State or other public  
20 agency, to—

- 21 (1) make investigations and surveys in connection  
22 with the classification and mapping of soils in such areas;  
23 (2) make studies necessary for the interpretation  
24 of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made by  
25 or available to the Secretary;



1           (3) furnish technical and advisory assistance for  
2     the protection, development, and economic utilization of  
3     the soil and water resources of such areas in connection  
4     with the planning by the State or other public agency  
5     for orderly adjustment in land use in such areas; and

6           (4) consult with other Federal agencies participat-  
7     ing or assisting in the planning and development of such  
8     areas in order to assure the coordination of the work au-  
9     thorized under this Act with the related work of such  
10    other agencies.

11    SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated  
12    such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of  
13    this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

---

# A BILL

---

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. ELLENDER

---

FEBRUARY 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1965

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry







89TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 947

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 2, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, re-  
4       sulting in the discontinuance of farming operations on large  
5       areas of agricultural land and the consequent serious de-  
6       terioration of such agricultural land and other land through  
7       erosion by wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural  
8       and other land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing

1 severe problems concerning needed changes in the use of  
2 such land and the effects of such changes on the protection,  
3 development, and utilization of the soil and water resources  
4 of such areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the  
5 Federal Government should cooperate with States and  
6 other public agencies for the purpose of providing assistance  
7 in planning for such changes in land use and for the pro-  
8 tection, development, and utilization of the soil and water  
9 resources of such areas, and thereby assist in preserving  
10 and protecting the Nation's soil and water resources.

11 SEC. 2. In order to cooperate with and assist States  
12 and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation  
13 districts, regional, State, and local planning boards and com-  
14 missions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly  
15 adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly ex-  
16 panding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas  
17 and for the protection, development, and utilization of the  
18 soil and water resources of such areas, the Secretary of  
19 Agriculture is authorized, upon the request of the State  
20 or other public agency, to—

21 (1) make investigations and surveys in connection  
22 with the classification and mapping of soils in such  
23 areas;

24 (2) make studies necessary for the interpretation



1 of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made  
2 by or available to the Secretary;

3 (3) furnish technical and advisory assistance in  
4 connection with such planning; and

5 (4) obtain the cooperation and assistance of other  
6 Federal agencies in carrying out the purposes of this  
7 Act.

8 SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated  
9 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of  
10 this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

## A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey

---

FEBRUARY 2, 1965

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry



upon all persons deriving title from either or both governments subsequent to the effective date of this Act: *Provided*, That the United States, the State of Alaska, of any other affected party may obtain judicial review of any determination by filing a petition for that purpose in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska within one year after the publication of such determination in the Federal Register. Such judicial review shall be on the basis of the record.

#### SOIL MAPS AND SUBURBS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I reintroduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service.

This bill has as its major objective the aid to planning of new suburban growth on what is now rural farmland.

My own State clearly demonstrates the urgent need for such action. New Jersey in 1970 will have increased its population by 25 percent to about 7.6 million. In the midst of this population explosion brought on by growing urbanization, the trend to suburban development will increase very rapidly. At this moment, however, our knowledge of soils data, septic systems, and general land capabilities cannot hope to keep pace with these changes unless our conservation services are expanded and improved.

In the past Congress has not overlooked this need. Many years ago it created the Soil Conservation Service within the Department of Agriculture to answer the national demand for reliable soils data. This agency has done excellent pioneer work in this important field, but it is hampered by limited resources, and the necessity of directing most of its efforts toward agricultural problems.

Under these adverse conditions the Soil Conservation Service has nevertheless succeeded in drawing up soil maps of over 20 percent of the acreage in the continental United States and has thereby provided farmers with vital information about the nature and value of their land.

The assistance which the farmer has received must now be given to the suburban dweller if he is going to be able to plan safely and confidently for his own future. Thousands of new homes will spring up in all parts of the Nation during the next few years, and community leaders must be equipped to deal with the numerous problems of sanitation and waste disposal which this will present.

Their difficulties can be eased, and the well-being of millions of our future homeowners will be protected if we take steps now to find out more about the land on which we live.

New Jersey must rely now on eight soil scientists to accomplish work in 15 years which could be done in 5 with the help of a few more such specialists.

This bill would enable the mobilization of additional needed manpower and would clear up the present confusion in the laws under which the Soil Conservation Service is now directed to act.

Considering the magnitude of this task and the comparatively slight cost of putting existing machinery in motion, I urge the Senate to give this bill prompt and favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 947) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on September 24, 1964, I submitted an amendment to the Export Control Act of 1949 (S. 3220) which would once and for all give American businessmen the protection they so urgently need to withstand the Arab boycott of firms dealing with Israel. I wish to reintroduce that bill today and to reclarify some of the conditions which dictate its passage.

The Arab States insist that they are still at war with Israel. Sometimes they act as though they are indeed still at war—for instance, in their costly schemes to stop Israel's water development with no ostensible advantage to themselves. Sometimes they act as though the war is over, as in the unperturbed entrance of Jordanians into Israel during the Pope's visit to that country. However, despite inconsistencies in actual policy, the Arabs always say that they are at war with Israel. They say it in the United Nations, at length, every year; they say it in their own newspapers and on every public occasion. What is more, they seem to expect the rest of the world to respect their belligerency.

This continuing hostility has caused difficult policy problems for the United States. We have strongly supported Israel's economic and political development since her creation.

As a nation we have sympathized with Israel's efforts to build democracy from the ashes of totalitarianism, in an area of the world where democracy has rarely succeeded. We have likewise looked favorably on any and all efforts of Arab leaders to improve the lot of their people. Our aid has poured into the Near East. Whether or not they think so, we have tried to help the Arabs to help themselves.

But our goodwill is often negated, because the Arabs maintain that it is impossible to remain friendly to both sides. They maintain that any American support for Israel's democracy is an American blow against the Arab world. In private, Arab leaders may acknowledge the opposite; in public, however, they shout the old axiom, "The friend of my enemy is my enemy" and the Arab masses believe them.

The Arab boycott of American firms dealing with Israel is one product of this public attitude; it has been officially neglected for too long; it is beginning to damage the domestic morale and worldwide dignity of the American business

community; we have been remiss in letting it go this far; we must stop it now.

Briefly, the boycott operates in this manner. The central boycott office in Damascus, an arm of the Arab league, writes to the American businessman, threatening him with boycott in 13 Arab States unless he answers an enclosed questionnaire about his dealings with Israel. And he had better answer it to the satisfaction of the Arab boycott office.

If I may, Mr. President, I would like to read the list of questions which the boycott office has the effrontery to ask. I ask unanimous consent that this insulting questionnaire be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the questionnaire was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ARAB BOYCOTT QUESTIONS

1. Do you now or did you ever have branch factories in Israel? In case you did in the past, or do now, please define the relationship of such branch with your company.
2. Do you now or did you ever have assembly plants in Israel?
3. Do you now or did you ever have in Israel general agencies head offices for your Middle Eastern operations?
4. Have you ever granted the right of using your patents, trademarks, copyrights, etc., to Israeli persons or firms?
5. Have you ever owned shares or any other interest in Israeli firms or businesses?
6. Have you ever rendered consultative services or technical assistance to an Israeli firm or business?
7. Do you now or did you ever represent any Israeli firm or other business in your country or elsewhere? In case you did in the past, or do now, please furnish us with the names and addresses of such Israeli firms or businesses.
8. Do you have a branch of yours in Israel? In case you have, please define the relationship of such branch with your firm.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, is it tolerable for an American businessman to be threatened with loss of his operations in the Arab world unless he ceases dealing with a country friendly to the United States? Is it tolerable for that businessman to be blackmailed into answering utterly private questions about his connections with Israel, and his plans for the future?

No one here today is arguing the ability of Arab governments to impose restrictions of trade upon Arab businessmen who might otherwise do business with Israel. But when the Arab world succeeds in imposing such restrictions on American firms, something is wrong. And when the U.S. Government can do nothing more to assist these firms than to say it does not condone the boycott, something is rotten.

Business International reported that as of January 1964, 164 American firms were on the blacklist. Fifty-three of them have been on since 1959 or before; 31 made it in 1961 and 1962; 33 made it by November 1963. In one case, a particularly vulnerable firm supplying parts for products distributed in the Arab world was made to leave its Israel operation through a secondary boycott—the Arabs put pressure on the customers and the customers, in self-defense, put pressure on the supplier. Thus blackmail breeds



more subtle blackmail; the businessman, without protection from his own country's laws, is placed in a position where both his dignity and his principles can be all too easily compromised.

It has been the policy of this Nation to protect its citizens wherever they are in danger. We protect them when they are held hostage to war in the Congo; we protect them when their holdings abroad are nationalized by making our aid contingent upon adequate compensation for expropriation.

Why should we make an exception for the Arab war against Israel? Every time a friendly nation wishes to make war on another friendly nation, shall we permit our business community to be caught in the path of the attack while our Government remains neutral?

Now that boycott office in Damascus is an Arab League office; its threats receive lipservice from sovereign Arab States, but Arab governments can and do differ with its policies. The sophisticated businessman might know full well that it takes more than a recommendation from the Arab League to make good a threat or a promise. But the individual businessman cannot know, except by costly and extensive investigation, whether the sovereign Arab States will accept or disregard Damascus directives; he is on unsafe ground; his decision whether or not to defy the boycott is a nerve-racking one.

One businessman may receive letters from several different boycott offices, because individual States maintain their own. In addition he may receive a covering letter from the Arab firm with which he plans to do business. An American company is more likely to be intimidated by this welter of documents than to understand that it implies chaos among Arab authorities. He has no defense against the intimidation; his government has provided him with no defense. Is it any wonder that, although he knows the Arabs have no right to blackmail him in this way, he may permit himself to be blackmailed?

Now it is a fact that many American firms are defying the boycott. This fact testifies to the strong belief of our business community in freedom of trade and to that community's determination to stand up to an irritating and continuous barrage. These firms have learned to live with the boycott; they have found ways to circumvent it; they have learned not to advertise the fact that they do business with both sides, out of practical respect for Arab sensitivities; they have learned to hide the fact that a boycott office which publicly threatens them privately agrees to leave them alone. Israel has learned to live with the boycott too. She has developed a thriving merchant marine as much because of as in spite of the boycott. She has found new markets where the logical markets were denied to her.

I am aware that the most powerful American firms have been able to live with boycott pressure. My point is that they should not have to.

I am asking Congress to amend the Export Control Act, under which the Commerce Department can now regu-

late exports in order to further the foreign policy of the United States. I want it unequivocally stated by Congress that it is in fact our foreign policy to oppose and condemn any trade boycott directed against foreign countries with which the United States maintains friendly relations.

In addition to officially declaring our opposition to such trade restraints barring commerce with friendly nations, the provisions of my bill will specifically outlaw the giving of information which could be used to further such boycotts or the signing of actual boycott agreements.

Under the protections of this legislation, any American businessman can then, with impunity, flatly refuse to divulge any information about his commercial investments or dealings with any of our foreign friends, and he can refuse to sign agreements not to trade or deal with those countries.

Several European governments have already taken positive steps to protect their citizens from the boycott. The International Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution last November counseling chambers of commerce never to certify negative certificates of origin. Let us sound the final note on this growing volume of protest by adopting the legislation I propose. There are some principles which this Nation, as leader of the free world, cannot afford to neglect. And one of those principles is the principle of free trade—trade free from intimidation, trade free from fear, trade free from obstruction by a war which we oppose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table through the close of business on the 9th of February for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 948) to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I join as cosponsor of the bill at this time? I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most unreasonable acts that the Arab States are permitted to do is to try to intimidate American and other firms from dealing with Israel. It is perfectly ridiculous, but it is very dangerous and serious to world trade and business. I welcome the opportunity to join with the Senator from New Jersey.

#### PROPOSED STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, I send to the desk for appropriate reference the proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965, together with a let-

ter of transmittal from Secretary Hodges and a statement of purpose and need.

Science and technology today have assumed an importance in our lives that was undreamed of in years past. They are vitally involved in assuring an adequate national defense. They are responsible for the present high levels of physical health enjoyed by so many of our citizens. They are at the heart of our efforts to explore and make use of outer space. They hold the key to unlimited sources of energy for the future. They have produced a miracle of abundance in American agriculture.

But there is one area in which science and technology are sometimes taken for granted, although it is a field that is as important as any of the others I have mentioned. I am referring to the dynamic growth of our industrial economy. A prosperous economy is absolutely dependent upon science and technology, and particularly upon our ability to apply the results of new knowledge to practical purposes. All of our efforts in space, in defense, in atomic energy, in public health, are ultimately based on the ability of the private sector of the economy to produce sufficient tax revenues to support these important national programs.

Fortunately, we have not neglected public support for science and technology. We are truly a scientific and technological giant among nations. The amount of new knowledge coming forth from our research and development laboratories accumulates at an ever-increasing rate. This new knowledge, however, does not automatically find its way into use everywhere it is needed, or everywhere it could be exploited.

Highly trained people are necessary to bridge the gap between what has been discovered in a laboratory and what can be used on a production line. Special mechanisms and institutions are needed to translate the results of science into the language of applied technology. The ability to do this must exist in all parts of the country if the results of science and technology are to bear productive fruit in all sections of the country.

To aid in stimulating and expanding the effectiveness of this vital process throughout the Nation, this new legislation has been proposed by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Federal agency responsible for fostering the steady growth of the American economy.

The State Technical Services Act is designed to permit the Federal Government to join with State governments, universities, and local communities in putting scientific and technical information, in a useful form, into the hands of private industry in all of the States. If successful, it would lead to increased employment through development of new business, improved processes and products, and new services that flow from the exploitation of technology. Finally, it would help make the products of American manufacturers more competitive in the rapidly expanding world markets.

These objectives would be accomplished by a program of technical services specifically designed to meet the







# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued April 15, 1966  
For actions of April 14, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 63

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....8	Expenditures.....10	Research.....11
Animal research.....11	Farm credit.....1	School milk.....5
Beef prices.....7	Farm labor.....6	Soil testing.....2
Child nutrition.....5	Labeling.....4	Taxes.....10
Community development....2	Milk.....5	Water pollution.....12
Conservation.....3	Packaging.....4	Water supply.....9
Cosponsors.....2	Pork prices.....7	

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Proxmire opposed proposed Child Nutrition Act. Sen. Carlson inserted article, "We Are No Stronger Than Our Soil." Sen. Javits introduced and discussed animal research bill.

## SENATE

1. FARM CREDIT. Passed as reported S. 2822, to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder. pp. 7773-6
2. COSPONSORS. Sen. Javits was added as a cosponsor of S. 902, a bill dealing "with the right or authority of the Department of Agriculture to test soils in urban areas," and S. 2934, the proposed Community Development District Act of 1966. p. 7769
3. CONSERVATION. Sen. Carlson commended the "great progress" which has been made in the fields of soil conservation and water retardation and inserted an article, "We Are No Stronger Than Our Soil." p. 7770

4. TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING. Sen. Hart stated that "most of the Nation's leading newspapers have endorsed the truth-in-packaging bill as necessary and good legislation," and inserted a supporting editorial. p. 7778
5. CHILD NUTRITION; MILK. Sen. Proxmire criticized the proposed Child Nutrition Act and the proposed cut in the school milk program. pp. 7797-8
6. FARM LABOR. Sen. Holland criticized pending farm labor legislation and inserted an article, "Farmers Seen Squeezed by L.B.J. Policies," which states that "farmers are paying a higher price for inflation than any other group." pp. 7798
7. PORK AND BEEF PRICES. Sen. Miller stated that "pork and beef prices have moved steadily downward" and "it is clear that livestock producers have not averaged out with prices that are fair in comparison with prices in other sectors of the economy." pp. 7789
8. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 18. p. 7804

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

9. WATER SUPPLY. Rep. Hosmer inserted an article on the use of Pacific Northwest excess water. p. A2077
10. EXPENDITURES; TAXES. Rep. Hosmer inserted an article, "The Choice is Obvious-- Spending Cut or Tax Boost?" p. A2079

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

11. ANIMAL RESEARCH. S. 3218, by Sen. Javits, to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; and to encourage the study and improvement of the care and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used in research, training, or testing; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Remarks of author p. 7768.
12. WATER POLLUTION. S. 3226, by Sen. Tydings, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize Federal assistance in carrying out short-term training programs in treatment work operation and maintenance; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author pp. 7801-2.







May 18, 1966

17. OPINION POLL. Rep. Shriver inserted the results of a questionnaire, including items of interest to this Department. pp. A2688-9
18. RIVER BASIN. Rep. Tunney inserted a report of the Irrigation Districts Ass'n in support of legislation to authorize the Lower Colorado River Basin project. pp. A2691-2
19. DAIRY FARMER. Extension of remarks of Rep. Thomson, Wisc., inserting Rep. Laird's letter to a constituent discussing the "very critical problems the dairy farmer--and, indeed, all farmers--face in this country as a result of recent Johnson-Freeman administration actions." p. A2692
20. BUDGET. Rep. Duncan, Tenn., inserted an article by Maurice Stans, "U. S. Fiscal Policy--The Critical Years." pp. A2700-2

SENATE

21. RECREATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10366, establishing the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Va. p. D429
22. LANDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 902, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in planning for changes in use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas "with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;" and ~~S. 2264, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to accept a cash equalization of exchanges for lands under his jurisdiction.~~ p. D429
23. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee approved for full committee consideration with amendments S. 3105, the fiscal 1967 authorizations for military construction, including authorization of appropriations for payment on the debt to the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign currencies used in prior years by the Department of Defense for foreign military family housing. p. D429
24. TARIFF. The Finance Committee voted to report without amendment (but did not actually report) H. R. 8376, to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation; H. R. 10998, to extend until Aug. 8, 1969, the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid; H. R. 12463, to extend until June 30, 1969, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; and H. R. 12864, to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders. pp. D429-30

BILLS INTRODUCED

25. SOYBEANS. H. R. 15151 by Rep. Jones of Missouri, H. R. 15152 by Rep. Abernethy, H. R. 15153 by Rep. Everett and H. R. 15154 by Rep. Stubblefield, to permit the planting of soybeans in lieu of cotton in certain disaster areas in 1966; to Agriculture Committee.
26. COTTON. H. R. 15155 by Rep. Abernethy, H. R. 15156 by Rep. Gathings and H. R. 15157 by Rep. Passman, to amend section 103 (d) (3) of the Agricultural Act of 1949; to Agriculture Committee. Remarks of Rep. Gathings, p. 10439.

27. FARM PRICES. H. Con. Res. 657 by Rep. Hall, H. Con. Res. 658 by Rep. Harvey of Michigan and H. Con. Res. 660 by Rep. Nelsen, expressing the sense of Congress that the administration should cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and that existing provisions of law respecting parity of farm prices apply to all agencies of the Government; to Agriculture Committee. Remarks of Rep. Nelsen, pp. 10423-4.
28. PARITY PRICES. H. Con. Res. 659 by Rep. King of Utah, relative to parity prices from agricultural commodities; to Agriculture Committee.
29. FARM PROGRAM. H. R. 15124 by Rep. Abbitt, to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to Agriculture Committee.
30. RESEARCH ANIMALS. H. R. 15129 by Rep. Fogarty, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal facilities, and to otherwise assure humane care and treatment of laboratory animals; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
31. PUBLIC WORKS. H. R. 15133 by Rep. Kupferman, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to Public Works Committee.
32. WATER POLLUTION. H. R. 15134 by Rep. Mackie, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve the programs under such act; to Public Works Committee.
33. IMPORTS. H. R. 15135 by Rep. Mackie, to regulate imports of milk and dairy products; to Ways and Means Committee.
34. PERSONNEL. H. R. 15159 by Rep. Dyal, to authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees of executive agencies assigned to duty at remote worksites; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
35. DISASTER RELIEF. H. R. 15160 by Rep. Moeller, to provide further assistance to farmers suffering crop or livestock losses in unprecedented frosts and freeze in 1966; to Agriculture Committee.
36. ELECTRIFICATION. H. R. 15162 by Rep. Schisler, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish REA electrification and telephone loan accounts and Federal banks for rural electric and rural telephone systems to provide supplemental financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs; to Agriculture Committee.

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS MAY 19:

Dept. of Transportation, S. and H. Government Operations Committees.  
Road authorizations, S. Public Works.  
Exporting of livestock products, S. Select Committee on Small Business.

oOo







# ***DIGEST*** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 20, 1966  
For actions of May 19, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 83

### CONTENTS

Acreage allotments....14,22	Household effects.....3	Rural development.....7
Adjournment.....12,19	Lands.....6,22	School milk.....11
Appropriations.....1	Legislative program....18	Social security.....29
Corkboard.....3	Loan pools.....2,17,25	Soil conservation.....20
Corn.....16	Military service.....26	Soybeans.....27
Education.....9	Minimum wage.....18	Sugar.....14
Electrification.....8	Oceanography.....15	Surplus property.....28
Ethics.....31	Participation	Transportation.....21
Exposition.....4	sales.....2,17,25	Veterans.....26
Farm prices.....10	Personnel.....5	Water pollution.....30
Food.....16	Poverty.....23	Water project.....24
Foreign trade.....3	REA.....8	Water supply.....13
Forest Service.....1	Recreation.....6	World food.....16
Forestry.....6	Review committees.....14	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill, including FS. Senate considered motion to agree to House version of participation sales bill.

### SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, including Forest Service items. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10532-41

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 14266, the Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office appropriation bill (S. Rept. 1178). pp. 10471-2



2. PARTICIPATION SALES. Began debate on a motion by Sen. Muskie to concur in the House version of S. 3283, the participation sales bill. pp. 10524-9, 10531-2
3. FOREIGN TRADE. Passed without amendment H. R. 8376, to make permanent the duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation, which had been reported without amendment earlier in the day by the Finance Committee (S. Rept. 1170). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10487, 10463  
Passed without amendment H. R. 12864, to make permanent the duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders, which had been reported without amendment earlier in the day by the Finance Committee (S. Rept. 1176). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10488-9, 10463  
Sen. Ribicoff inserted an address by R. C. Fenton, "Investment Abroad and the Balance of Payments." pp. 10507-9
4. EXPOSITION. Received a Commerce Department report on U. S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. p. 10467
5. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill to amend Sec. 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, restricting promotions and transfers; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 10467
6. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2264, to authorize this Department to accept a cash equalization of exchanges for its lands (S. Rept. 1181), and H. R. 10366, to establish the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area, Jefferson National Forest, Va. (S. Rept. 1182). p. 10472  
Received a Calif. Legislature resolution favoring additional fire protection on the national forests. p. 10468
7. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 902, to authorize this Department to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other non-agricultural use areas (S. Rept. 1180). p. 10472
8. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Miller spoke in favor of S. 3337, to provide for supplemental REA financing, but said he understood the administration version would not be introduced in the Senate. Agreed to Sen. Cooper's request that the bill be held at the desk until May 20 for addition of cosponsors. pp. 10484-5
9. EDUCATION. Sen. Kuchel recommended continuation of educational assistance for federally impacted areas. pp. 10498-9
10. FARM PRICES. Sen. Carlson said farmers are not to blame for inflation and inserted an article on this subject. p. 10500
11. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire spoke against budget cuts in the school milk program. p. 10506
12. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 23. p. 10557

## SOIL INFORMATION ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

---

MAY 19, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,  
submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 902]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 902) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

#### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies to assist them in community planning and resource development, including planning for such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities, and water and sewage facilities.

#### COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The committee had before it S. 902, introduced by Senator Ellender and Senator Javits, and S. 947, introduced by Senator Williams of New Jersey, substantially identical bills. The committee substitute does not differ in substance from either of these bills. The purpose of the substitute is to make it clear that the bill would be applicable to farm as well as nonfarm areas, and that it is part of the general pattern of agricultural legislation providing for soil surveys, conservation, changes in farmland use, and community development districts.

## NEED FOR THE BILL

Community development districts, soil conservation districts, planning and zoning boards and commissions, and other local units of government need soil surveys as a basis for developing long-range plans and programs for the orderly development of rural communities and the renewal of natural resources in areas of rapidly changing land use.

Traditionally, soil surveys have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of a soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreational facilities. Soil surveys include maps of the kinds of soil, which are interpreted according to such qualities as soil wetness, overflow hazards, depth to rock, hard-pans, permeability, erodibility, shrink-swell potential, and hazard of slippage on slopes. Soil surveys provide information that can be used to predict the results of using specific kinds of soil in different ways.

The enactment of this bill would clarify and restate policy for the Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies about work in areas of rapid changes in land use and where careful advanced planning is essential to avoid huge losses of both private and public investments. It would facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in both rural areas undergoing drastic changes in land use and in areas of rapid development. In many areas soil surveys are essential for community planning. Enactment of this bill would provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities. It is not intended that soil surveys would be made of the built-up centers of metropolitan areas.

The Department of Agriculture, with its cooperators in the National Cooperative Soil Survey, has responsibility for soil surveys and has a trained staff of capable specialists to provide essential technical information about soil, water, and plant resources needed by community planners and others. The bill extends methods already tested and known to help develop solutions to problems in community planning and the safe and efficient use of soil and water resources.

The increased demands for soil surveys in areas of rapid growth and for community development would be provided for by the enactment of this bill. The important task of making soil surveys on the farm and ranch lands of the Nation would be maintained in proper balance.

Many local units of government already contribute funds to assist the Department of Agriculture and its cooperators in carrying out soil surveys urgently needed for planning ahead of rapid growth or land-use adjustment. Funding arrangements are included in cooperative agreements between the Soil Conservation Service and the applicable local unit government. The enactment of this bill would stimulate more local effort and financing for soil surveys in specific areas. It will not cost any appreciable amount of additional Federal funds.

In addition to the assistance of the State agricultural experiment stations and other State agencies, in fiscal year 1966 the Department of Agriculture made financial arrangements with local governments for contributions amounting to approximately \$600,000 for speeding up



the completion of soil surveys in specific areas. In fiscal year 1964 these local contributions totaled about \$225,000.

In a great many parts of the country a clear-cut distinction no longer exists between rural and urban living. As modern highways are built many nonfarm people establish their homes in rural areas. To achieve good living for both, advanced community planning is essential. Such areas have new and compelling needs for water management, sewage disposal, schools, recreation areas, and other facilities. Such planning requires accurate knowledge of the soils and their alternative potentials in order to avoid serious losses of investment and construction and maintenance costs. To solve these problems the results of the soil surveys and technical assistance should be available to the planning agencies, the residents, and other public and private service agencies.

At the present time, about 10 percent of the 50 million acres being mapped annually in the National Cooperative Soil Survey is located in communities facing urgent planning problems. Not over 10 percent of this, or about 500,000 acres, will be used for housing and similar intensive uses; since about 10 or 15 times as much land as is needed for such uses must be surveyed in order to determine suitable alternative sites therefor. The land not devoted to such uses will be used for farming, forestry, recreation, and other less intensive uses, so that cooperatively financed soil surveys to determine sites for intensive uses helps to provide soil information for agricultural and other less intensive uses. At the present rate of survey work in communities facing urgent planning problems it would require some 20 to 30 years to complete the soil surveys needed by such communities.

In the meantime many costly mistakes would be made, mistakes that could be avoided through the use of soil surveys for a tiny fraction of the cost. Already the officials of hundreds of land-use planning bodies are depending on published soil surveys. This places a new emphasis and new urgency on the acceleration of their completion.

Soil surveys have already saved untold millions of dollars of both private and public investment. Estimates made by community planners of the value of soil surveys run as high as \$2 million per year for a county. Hundreds of examples have been cited where many thousands of dollars are lost annually through poor site selection for specific uses. In many instances amounts up to one-quarter million dollars have been saved by choosing the right site for individual school buildings. Further examples of other great losses that can be avoided through site selection and the planning of proper measures include: Flooded homes and basements; failures of on-site sewage disposal systems; failures of buildings and highways due to poor-bearing qualities of soils; and excessive construction costs of roads, utility lines, pipelines, and so on.

We should double or triple the present rate of completing soil surveys in areas undertaking community planning to take care of rapid expansion and economic growth. This would mean mapping at least 10 to 15 million acres annually in such areas. At current price levels the cost would amount to about 50 cents per acre. At the present rate of completing soil surveys in such areas, population would have increased by 50 percent in the meantime. From past experience it is clear that enormous investments by individuals and by public agencies would be lost. These can be avoided by use

of soil surveys. The enactment of this bill would give emphasis to the need for moving ahead to avoid these enormous preventable losses of private and public investments.

#### DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
*Washington, D.C., January 26, 1965.*

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

The Department of Agriculture recommends enactment of this legislation as a means to help provide an orderly transition from rural to urban land uses. This requires information on soils for location of industry, commerce, residential housing, parks and recreational areas, and strategic open space. Many urban areas seek to preserve open space in a rural setting. Soil surveys provide scientific information for interpretations and judgment decisions related to the capabilities and limitations for land for different uses and for management of soils during transition and under the new uses. The Department of Agriculture is currently supplying many of the services needed for rural-urban planning through its soil survey, extension, rural areas development, watershed planning, forestry, and economic research programs.

Although the Department already has authority to make soil surveys, the proposed bill would serve essentially to give clear-cut recognition and emphasis to the need for such surveys and interpretive services for areas making specific requests. This is highly important to further cooperative efforts of rural and urban people.

Enactment of this proposal would encourage local and State organizations to make additional contributions to this type of activity.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, while there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program, this advice does not involve any commitment that appropriations to the Department of Agriculture under this proposed legislation would be recommended.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

○

**S. 902**

[Report No. 1180]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1965

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 19, 1966

Reported by Mr. EASTLAND, with amendments

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

---

**A BILL**

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       ~~That the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, result-~~  
4       ~~ing in the discontinuance of farming operations on large areas~~  
5       ~~of agricultural land and the consequent serious deterioration~~  
6       ~~of such agricultural land and other land through erosion by~~  
7       ~~wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural and other~~  
8       ~~land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing severe~~



1 problems concerning needed changes in the use of such land  
2 and the effects of such changes on the protection, develop-  
3 ment, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such  
4 areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal  
5 Government should cooperate with States and other public  
6 agencies for the purpose of providing assistance in planning  
7 for such changes in land use and for the protection, devel-  
8 opment, and utilization of the soil and water resources of  
9 such areas, and thereby assist in preserving and protecting  
10 the Nation's soil and water resources.

11 SEC. 2. In order to cooperate with and assist States  
12 and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation  
13 districts, regional, State, and local planning boards and com-  
14 missions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly  
15 adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly expand-  
16 ing urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas and  
17 for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil  
18 and water resources of such areas, the Secretary of Agricul-  
19 ture is authorized, upon the request of the State or other  
20 public agency, to—

- 21       (1) make investigations and surveys in connection  
22       with the classification and mapping of soils in such areas;  
23       (2) make studies necessary for the interpretation  
24       of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made by  
25       or available to the Secretary;

(3) furnish technical and advisory assistance for the protection, development, and economic utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas in connection with the planning by the State or other public agency for orderly adjustment in land use in such areas; and

(4) consult with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work authorized under this Act with the related work of such other agencies.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

*That in recognition of the increasing need for soil surveys by States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development for protecting and improving the quality of the environment, meeting recreational needs, conserving land and water resources, providing for multiple uses of such resources, and controlling and reducing pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farmlands being shifted to other uses, resulting from rapid expansions in the uses of land for industry, housing, transportation, recreation, and related services, it is the sense of Congress that the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture*

1 *should be conducted so as to make available soil surveys to*  
2 *meet such needs of the States and other public agencies in con-*  
3 *nection with community planning and resource development.*

4 *SEC. 2. In order to provide soil surveys to assist States,*  
5 *their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation dis-*  
6 *tricts, towns, cities, planning boards and commissions, com-*  
7 *munity development districts, and other public agencies in*  
8 *community planning and resource development for the pro-*  
9 *tection and improvement of the quality of the environment,*  
10 *recreational development, the conservation of land and water*  
11 *resources, the development of multiple uses of such resources,*  
12 *and the control and prevention of pollution from sediment*  
13 *and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, in-*  
14 *cluding farm and nonfarm areas, the Secretary of Agri-*  
15 *culture shall, upon the request of a State or other public*  
16 *agency, provide by means of such cooperative arrangements*  
17 *with the State or other public agency as he may deem*  
18 *advisable, the following assistance with respect to such areas*  
19 *and purposes:*

20 *(1) the making of studies and reports necessary*  
21 *for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil;*

22 *(2) an intensification of the use and benefits of the*  
23 *National Cooperative Soil Survey;*

24 *(3) the furnishing of technical and other assistance*  
25 *needed for full use of soil surveys; and*



1           (4) consultation with other Federal agencies par-  
2       ticipating or assisting in the planning and development  
3       of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the  
4       work under this Act with the related work of such other  
5       agencies.

6       SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the  
7       Secretary shall make a reasonable effort to assure that the  
8       contributions of any State or other public agency under any  
9       cooperative agreement which may be entered into between  
10      the Secretary and such State or other public agency with  
11      respect to a soil survey shall be a substantial portion of the  
12      cost of such soil survey.

13      SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated  
14      such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of  
15      this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes."

---

---

**A BILL**

---

---

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. EILENDER and Mr. JAVITS

---

---

FEBRUARY 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1965

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 19, 1966

Reported with amendments







# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 24, 1966  
For actions of May 23, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 84

### CONTENTS

Appropriations.....11,29	Food for peace.....15	Personnel.....13,32
Attorneys.....35	Foreign aid.....9,23,36	Population.....12
Commodity exchanges.....30	Foreign trade.....15	Poverty.....34
Cost of living.....16	Forestry.....7	Recreation.....7,27,38
Economy.....16	Information.....25	School milk.....4
Electrification.....20,28	Labeling.....18	Small business.....19
Farm policies.....17	Land exchanges.....6	Soil surveys.....5
Farm prices.....8,17	Loan pools.....1,21	Soybeans.....14
Farm program.....22	Loans.....19	Tobacco.....3
Firefighting.....32	Military construction...33	Transportation.....26,37
Fisheries.....31	Participation sales...1,21	Water resources.....10
Flood protection.....24	Pay.....13	Wheat agreement.....2

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate concurred in House participation sales bill. Senate received protocol to extend international wheat agreement. Senate committee voted to report Federal pay bill.

### SENATE

1. PARTICIPATION SALES. By a 50-20 vote, concurred in the House version of S. 3283, the participation sales bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. The bill is designed to provide an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and to carry forward the objective of substituting private for public credit in funding the loan programs. It would accomplish this by enabling these agencies, with the approval of Congress, to enter into trust agreements with the Federal National Mortgage Association whereby that Association would sell participation certificates based on a pool or pools of Federal credit agency loans. pp. 10653-60

2. WHEAT AGREEMENT. Received from the President a protocol for extension of the International Wheat Agreement for 1 year from July 31, 1966. pp. 10616-7
3. TOBACCO. Sen. Moss criticized the USDA film, "The World of Pleasure," and said warning labels are needed on cigarettes for export. p. 10628
4. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire said this Department admits that the child nutrition bill would not reach a majority of needy children with free milk. pp. 10628-9
5. SOIL SURVEYS. Passed as reported S. 902, to require this Department to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development. pp. 10631-3
6. LAND EXCHANGES. Passed without amendment S. 2264, to authorize this Department to complete authorized land exchanges if the lands offered to the U. S. are worth at least two-thirds of the value of the Federal lands and the balance is paid in cash or a cash deposit or performance bond is given assuring conveyance to the U. S. of additional acceptable lands for the balance of the value. pp. 10633-4
7. FOREST RECREATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 10366, to establish the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area, Jefferson National Forest, Va. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 10634
8. FARM PRICES. Sen. Symington said food prices have been going up while farm prices have been going down and that the National Commission on Food Marketing is considering this situation. pp. 10643-4
9. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Lausche commended India for permitting a fertilizer company to make an investment there. pp. 10645-6
10. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Anderson inserted and commended an address by Sen. Jackson, "Water and the Nation." pp. 10649-50
11. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed as reported H. R. 14266, the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 10660-3
12. POPULATION. Sen. Gruening commended Federal assistance in connection with population control. pp. 10663-7
13. PERSONNEL; PAY. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 14122, the Federal pay bill. As approved by the Senate committee, the bill provides as follows:
  - "(1) Provides a 2.9-percent increase across the board, effective July 1, 1966;
  - "(2) Retains the House-passed one-step increase in the Government's contribution to high-option health insurance by 10 percent;
  - "(3) Retains the provision for retirement on a full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service, or at age 60 after 20 years' service;
  - "(4) Liberalizes survivor annuity benefits for future widows of Federal employees and children of deceased Federal employees;
  - "(5) Provides a 10-percent increase in the annuities of widows or future widows of Federal employees who died or retired prior to October 11, 1962. This provision was adopted in lieu of the House provision for recomputation of



be a valuable compact source of energy with great potential for the future. The Atomic Energy Commission, through its laboratories and contractors, has been developing which we call SNAP devices—SNAP standing for Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power. These long-lived, compact and virtually trouble-free power supplies are already in use in remote, unmanned facilities such as a navigational space satellite, a deep-sea navigational beacon off Bermuda, and an automatic weather station in the Antarctic.

We are actively at work developing new and improved SNAP isotopic-powered systems, and those using small compact reactors, for wider use around the world and particularly for out-of-this-world—in space—where we believe they will play an essential role in supplying the power necessary to operate electronic systems and sustain life.

But SNAP devices are only auxiliary power supplies. Far greater amounts of power will be necessary to propel man into space, with the equipment he will need, if he is to travel any great distance into that vast unknown, if he is ever to reach and explore the planets. In cooperation with NASA the AEC is developing nuclear powered rockets which will be able to do the job of ferrying huge manned and unmanned payloads back and forth across the solar system.

Nuclear propulsion of another type—that used on and under the ocean—will play a most important role in our future. The Nuclear Ship *Savannah*, the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, is in regular commercial service after 90,000 miles of trouble-free demonstration cruises to the world's leading ports. The *Savannah*, which can travel around the globe 14 times on a single fuel loading, is still operating on its original nuclear core installed on November 8, 1961. Other nuclear ships are being considered—ships which could be a tremendous asset to our future merchant marine.

The nuclear submarine has proved the superiority of nuclear energy operating in the ocean's depths. Today there is great interest in using the atom to supply power for oceanographic work—to propel undersea craft and give us auxiliary power for the variety of work which will be done in this growing field. We are already at work in cooperation with the Navy on a deep submergence oceanographic vessel which will be nuclear powered.

Another use of nuclear energy, which I believe will be playing a significant role in the future, is derived from the great explosive power of the atom. Putting this enormous energy to work constructively is the aim of the AEC's "Plowshare" program, the term "Plowshare" being derived from the Biblical phrase concerning the beating of swords into plowshares. By developing "clean" nuclear explosives and special excavation techniques we hope someday to use the atom efficiently and economically in large-scale earth-moving projects such as the digging of canals, harbors and mountain passes. There is also much current interest in using nuclear explosives underground as an aid in mining various materials and to create large subterranean storage areas.

I have been speaking primarily of the application of nuclear energy and the many benefits we are gaining, and will be gaining, from them. But as I mentioned at the beginning of this talk, our work and our investigations are constant reminders of how much more we need to do and to learn. Therefore, in the nuclear field we continue to put great emphasis on research. Our National Laboratories across the country are busy exploring many basic phenomena of nature and delving deeper and deeper into the heart of the atom. Indeed, one of the most fascinating aspects of this whole field of nuclear energy is the extreme range of the work—for while we develop nuclear propulsion to take us to the stars and at the same

time analyze the cosmic rays that come from them, we also explore the very nature of matter, the very substance of the stars, of ourselves and all that exists. It is a most exciting field and a most exciting time to be working in it.

I have tried to review for you today some of the progress and promise of the atom. Perhaps I can best summarize what all this will mean to us and our children by giving you the answer to a question I was asked during a television interview recently. The question was: "How will nuclear science affect the average man in 15 to 20 years?" My answer was as follows:

The chances are pretty good that his town and his home will be lit, heated and run by electricity from a silent, clean and economic nuclear powerplant. Air pollution may be further reduced by the use of electric-powered automobiles whose batteries will be charged at service stations receiving their power from the nuclear plant. It might well be that the same plant is helping to supply the town with fresh water by desalting sea water.

Much of the food our "average man" and his family will eat may be pasteurized for longer preservation by radiation from a radioisotope—radiation that will not affect the taste or nutritional value of the food. Some of his food may very well come from crops improved through the use of radioisotopes.

Radioisotopes and radiation will be responsible for bringing him a variety of new and improved products. The quality of these products will be controlled by highly sensitive processing equipment using the radioisotope, and many of the materials used will be essentially new substances polymerized by radiation. New plastics and plastic-wood combinations are already being made by this method of using radiation to change the molecular structure of materials. Some of the raw materials, such as oil, used in manufacturing these new products will have been discovered by exploration methods employing the radioisotope.

Underground nuclear explosions may be an aid in the mining of several materials our "average man" uses daily, or to create large underground reservoirs to hold supplies of gas or oil until they are pumped out of the ground for his use. And nuclear power will be used to explore and pump up untold riches from the ocean floor.

Radioisotopes will be in common use in our local hospitals and medical centers for the rapid diagnosis and treatment of many illnesses, not to mention that previously these and other isotopes will have been used in extensive biological and medical research to bring the physicians new knowledge of the body and life processes. Certain medical problems that would have previously required surgery will be better handled with new techniques in using radiation or the laser beam, and if conventional surgery is needed, the chances are that the surgeon's instruments will have been sterilized by radiation. If, in our "average man's" family, someone has developed a heart condition, that person's life may be considerably prolonged by the use of the radioisotope-powered artificial heart I mentioned before.

Now looking at some more pleasant aspects of the atom's work, if our citizen of the future wants to take his family on a trip there is a good chance that his car or train (both powered by nuclear generated electricity) may travel through a mountain pass cut by nuclear explosives. If he travels by sea, he may very well sail on a fast, clean, nuclear ship—possibly through a canal made by nuclear excavation to a new port carved out by the same method. On this trip his ship will probably be guided with the help of isotopic-powered navigational satellites, beacons and buoys, and perhaps some lighthouses manned only by the atom.

Unmanned weather stations, operating on nuclear energy and located in remote areas

all over the globe, will be sending information to satellites powered by the radioisotope, which in turn will help to provide accurate, long-range forecasting possibly leading to some methods of weather control.

Our family of the future will watch live color telecasts, direct to their homes, of events happening anywhere on the globe—telecasts made possible by orbiting synchronous satellites powered by nuclear energy. And perhaps on one of these television programs they will follow a manned mission to a distant planet—a trip made possible through the use of nuclear rockets and auxiliary nuclear power.

These are only a few of the ways in which nuclear science and nuclear energy—in combination with advances in other sciences and technologies—will affect our lives in the coming years.

In speaking of the future we must remember that although we may be talking in terms of the years, decades and centuries ahead, the future has its roots in the present, and what we do now—today and tomorrow—determines the course of our lives and those of our children. It is therefore important that we work and plan now for the years ahead. It is also important that we continue our efforts to learn and to grow with the new-found knowledge our research will bring us. If we do, and if we apply what we learn in a constructive way beneficial to all men, I think we can face the future and shape our new worlds with confidence, and ultimately with great success.

#### THE CALENDAR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, namely, Calendars Nos. 1144, 1145, and 1146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE INCREASING NEED FOR SOIL SURVEYS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 902) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in recognition of the increasing need for soil surveys by States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development for protecting and improving the quality of the environment, meeting recreational needs, conserving land and water resources, providing for multiple uses of such resources, and controlling and reducing pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farmlands being shifted to other uses, resulting from rapid expansions in the uses of land for industry, housing, transportation, recreation, and related services, it is the sense of Congress that the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture should be conducted so as to make available soil surveys to meet such needs of the States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development.

SEC. 2. In order to provide soil surveys to assist States, their political subdivisions, soil



and water conservation districts, towns, cities, planning boards and commissions, community development districts, and other public agencies in community planning and resource development for the protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, recreational development, the conservation of land and water resources, the development of multiple uses of such resources, and the control and prevention of pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farm and nonfarm areas, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the request of a State or other public agency, provide by means of such cooperative arrangements with the State or other public agency as he may deem advisable, the following assistance with respect to such areas and purposes:

(1) the making of studies and reports necessary for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil;

(2) an intensification of the use and benefits of the National Cooperative Soil Survey;

(3) the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys; and

(4) consultation with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work under this Act with the related work of such other agencies.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the Secretary shall make a reasonable effort to assure that the contributions of any State or other public agency under any cooperative agreement which may be entered into between the Secretary and such State or other public agency with respect to a soil survey shall be a substantial portion of the cost of such soil survey.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this proposed legislation is authored by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished senior Senator from New York. Our able colleague, Mr. JAVITS, is necessarily absent. He has, however, prepared a statement to accompany the favorable reporting of this legislation to the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his statement be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I am very pleased with the favorable report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on S. 902 which provides for the Department of Agriculture to conduct soil surveys in areas of rapid land-use changes.

As a cosponsor of this bill, I believe it is urgently needed if we are to halt some of the tragic waste and misuse of our land and the pollution of our streams.

Problems brought about by land changing from agricultural to nonagricultural uses are not confined to any particular area in our Nation. Perhaps it has not been fully realized that any land use—whether for farming or for any other development—should be based on the capability of the soil. Farmers have relied on soil survey information for many years. Now, community planners are becoming aware that they are enormously aided by the soil maps resulting from Soil Conservation Service soil surveys. The maps and accompanying interpretive material are usually the most detailed single source of information available about the physical nature of the area. Planners and other land users are handicapped if they do not have this basic information. They are increasingly turning to the Soil Conservation Service for help.

This bill would clarify the position of the Department of Agriculture and authorize them to make their skills available to the many communities facing urbanization problems.

Land developments pushing out from cities are taking bigger bites into our rural and agricultural land. We do not have room for mistakes in land use. We cannot afford them dollar-wise or resource-wise. And there is no excuse for permitting them when we have the know-how to avoid them.

Improper land use strikes at both the public and private pocketbook. I have been told of a housing development in New York State built by a contractor who had no knowledge of soil limitations. The result was wet basements, wells with water unfit to drink, and septic tanks that did not work. The owners of the new homes abandoned them, put them up for sale, and lost their down payments. The subsequent buyers fared the same and the houses again changed owners. With proper soils information, the contractor, within a matter of hours, would have known that the area was not suitable for a housing development.

In another case, a municipal reservoir cost an estimated \$200,000 more than expected because of the type of soil it was built on. The extra cost was for sealing the reservoir to make it waterproof. The cost could have been avoided if soil survey information had been available to help select the site.

In still another case, a school playground and parking lot could not be used because they were too wet. A \$65,000 bond issue was passed to raise the money to provide drainage. It could have been avoided.

These are just random examples—but not unusual. The same things are happening across the Nation. Other examples extend into all areas of planning and developing a new community—roads, sewer lines, utilities, sanitation, and industrial and shopping center sites.

As they grow, communities are confronted with major land-use decisions. The decisions are made more difficult by mounting demands that bring intense pressures on land and water resources. Where soils information is available and is used in advance community planning, it will save taxpayers thousands of dollars and assure them of a healthy and pleasant environment.

Once the soils information is obtained for an area, it serves a wide variety of purposes for both public and private groups—for community leaders, zoning boards, planning commissions, engineers, highway departments, real estate developers, and tax assessors, to name a few.

I strongly urge that the Senate give its unanimous approval to this bill.

#### BROADENING SOIL SURVEY USE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for their favorable action on S. 902 which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development.

Earlier I had introduced S. 947 for the same purpose—to strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service. My bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is recognized in the report on S. 902. I want to express my appreciation to the committee chairman for this recognition in the committee report.

Furthermore, I want to speak to the

significance of the enactment of this important legislation.

As is pointed out in the committee report, the enactment of this bill will clarify and restate policy for the Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies about work in areas of rapid change in land use and where careful advanced planning is essential to avoid huge losses of both private and public investments. It would facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in both rural areas undergoing drastic changes in land use and in areas of rapid development. In many areas soil surveys are essential for community planning. Enactment of this bill will provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities.

This bill has particular application in New Jersey, as well as in most other States. Some day people may wonder why New Jersey was ever called the Garden State. At the rate its farmland is disappearing, there will be little space left to raise the garden produce that has made it one of the Nation's richest farming States.

But New Jersey is not alone. In nearly every State in the Union, much of our best farmland is gradually disappearing. It is being swallowed up by housing developments, superhighways, supermarkets, shopping centers, airports, military reserves, outdoor theaters, rambling one-story schools, and sprawling industrial plants.

This changeover creates new problems for the soil conservationist as well as others. In New Jersey's Camden and Burlington Counties, for example, farmers do not feel inclined to invest in a conservation program that would protect and improve the soil. The reason is that the real estate value of their land has climbed so high they are unable to tell how much longer they will be in the farming business. One farmer after another falls victim to the trend and sells out. If they try to hang on, urban taxes finally force them out of farming.

The soil survey used to guide land use adjustments for the orderly planning and application of soil and water conservation on farms, ranches, and watersheds, is now paying dividends for the nonagricultural user as well.

Many soil survey interpretations that aid in establishing soil and water conservation measures on the farm can be used equally well for nonagricultural purposes, such as locating soils for housing, sewage disposal, industry, highways, airports, and general town planning.

Using the soil survey, industry finds the proper place to build, homeowners and builders locate the best place for houses and septic tanks, and counties and municipalities choose the proper sites for reservoirs, highways, pipelines, and sewage systems.

As urban planning groups become more aware of available soil survey information, requests for such information will increase. As our population increases and cities and towns spread more and more into rural areas, soil surveys will play an even larger role in the development of these areas. Through proper



planning we can meet these additional demands on the land while striking a blow at rural poverty and heading off the specter of rural-urban slums.

The Soil Conservation Service has the technical know-how and long years of experience that town planners, State agencies and individuals find valuable in developing the natural resources of the community. Citizens have made good use of this experience and knowledge in the past. They are making good use of it now. They can make far more use of it in the future with the enactment of S. 902. I urge its unanimous adoption by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1180), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies to assist them in community planning and resource development, including planning for such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities, and water and sewage facilities.

#### COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The committee had before it S. 902, introduced by Senator ELLENDER and Senator JAVITS, and S. 947, introduced by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, substantially identical bills. The committee substitute does not differ in substance from either of these bills. The purpose of the substitute is to make it clear that the bill would be applicable to farm as well as nonfarm areas, and that it is part of the general pattern of agricultural legislation providing for soil surveys, conservation, changes in farmland use, and community development districts.

#### NEED FOR THE BILL

Community development districts, soil conservation districts, planning and zoning boards and commissions, and other local units of government need soil surveys as a basis for developing long-range plans and programs for the orderly development of rural communities and the renewal of natural resources in areas of rapidly changing land use.

Traditionally, soil surveys have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of a soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreational facilities. Soil

surveys include maps of the kinds of soil, which are interpreted according to such qualities as soil wetness, overflow hazards, depth to rock, hardpans, permeability, erodibility, shrink-swell potential, and hazard of slippage on slopes. Soil surveys provide information that can be used to predict the results of using specific kinds of soil in different ways.

The enactment of this bill would clarify and restate policy for the Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies about work in areas of rapid changes in land use and where careful advanced planning is essential to avoid huge losses of both private and public investments. It would facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in both rural areas undergoing drastic changes in land use and in areas of rapid development. In many areas soil surveys are essential for community planning. Enactment of this bill would provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities. It is not intended that soil surveys would be made of the built-up centers of metropolitan areas.

The Department of Agriculture, with its cooperators in the National Cooperative Soil Survey, has responsibility for soil surveys and has a trained staff of capable specialists to provide essential technical information about soil, water, and plant resources needed by community planners and others. The bill extends methods already tested and known to help develop solutions to problems in community planning and the safe and efficient use of soil and water resources.

The increased demands for soil surveys in areas of rapid growth and for community development would be provided for by the enactment of this bill. The important task of making soil surveys on the farm and ranch lands of the Nation would be maintained in proper balance.

Many local units of government already contribute funds to assist the Department of Agriculture and its cooperators in carrying out soil surveys urgently needed for planning ahead of rapid growth or land-use adjustment. Funding arrangements are included in cooperative agreements between the Soil Conservation Service and the applicable local unit government. The enactment of this bill would stimulate more local effort and financing for soil surveys in specific areas. It will not cost any appreciable amount of additional Federal funds.

In addition to the assistance of the State agricultural experiment stations and other State agencies, in fiscal year 1966 the Department of Agriculture made financial arrangements with local governments for contributions amounting to approximately \$600,000 for speeding up the completion of soil surveys in specific areas. In fiscal year 1964 these local contributions totaled about \$225,000.

In a great many parts of the country a clear-cut distinction no longer exists between rural and urban living. As modern highways are built many nonfarm people establish their homes in rural areas. To achieve good living for both, advanced community planning is essential. Such areas have new and compelling needs for water management, sewage disposal, schools, recreation areas, and other facilities. Such planning requires accurate knowledge of the soils and their alternative potentials in order to avoid serious losses of investment and construction and maintenance costs. To solve these problems the results of the soil surveys and technical assistance should be available to the planning agencies, the residents, and other public and private service agencies.

At the present time, about 10 percent of the 50 million acres being mapped annually in the National Cooperative Soil Survey is located in communities facing urgent planning problems. Not over 10 percent of this, or

about 500,000 acres, will be used for housing and similar intensive uses; since about 10 or 15 times as much land is needed for such uses must be surveyed in order to determine suitable alternative sites therefor. The land not devoted to such uses will be used for farming, forestry, recreation, and other less intensive uses, so that cooperatively financed soil surveys to determine sites for intensive uses helps to provide soil information for agricultural and other less intensive uses. At the present rate of survey work in communities facing urgent planning problems it would require some 20 to 30 years to complete the soil surveys needed by such communities.

In the meantime many costly mistakes would be made, mistakes that could be avoided through the use of soil surveys for a tiny fraction of the cost. Already the officials of hundreds of land-use planning bodies are depending on published soil surveys. This places a new emphasis and new urgency on the acceleration of their completion.

Soil surveys have already saved untold millions of dollars of both private and public investment. Estimates made by community planners of the value of soil surveys run as high as \$2 million per year for a county. Hundreds of examples have been cited where many thousands of dollars are lost annually through poor site selection for specific uses. In many instances amounts up to one-quarter million dollars have been saved by choosing the right site for individual school buildings. Further examples of other great losses that can be avoided through site selection and the planning of proper measures include: Flooded homes and basements; failures of on-site sewage disposal systems; failures of buildings and highways due to poor-bearing qualities of soils; and excessive construction costs of roads, utility lines, pipelines, and so on.

We should double or triple the present rate of completing soil surveys in areas undertaking community planning to take care of rapid expansion and economic growth. This would mean mapping at least 10 to 15 million acres annually in such areas. At current price levels the cost would amount to about 50 cents per acre. At the present rate of completing soil surveys in such areas, population would have increased by 50 percent in the meantime. From past experience it is clear that enormous investments by individuals and by public agencies would be lost. These can be avoided by use of soil surveys. The enactment of this bill would give emphasis to the need for moving ahead to avoid these enormous preventable losses of private and public investments.

#### LAND EXCHANGES—PART PAYMENT IN CASH

The bill (S. 2264) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept a cash equalization of exchanges for lands under his jurisdiction, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2264

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, whenever lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized to be exchanged for lands in non-Federal ownership, if the lands offered to the United States have a value at least equal to two-thirds of the value of the Federal lands selected, the exchange may be completed upon payment to the Secretary of Agriculture of the difference in values, or the submittal of a cash deposit or a performance bond in an amount at least equal to the difference of values assuring that additional lands acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture and



at least equal to the difference in values will be conveyed to the United States within a time certain to be specified by the Secretary of Agriculture. Any amounts so paid and cash deposits forfeited or collections upon performance bonds submitted shall be covered into a special fund in the Treasury which when appropriated shall be available until expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the acquisition of lands in the same State as the Federal lands selected and which are determined by him to be suitable for the same purposes as the lands initially conveyed to the United States in the exchange transaction. Lands so acquired shall have the same status and shall be subject to the same laws, regulations, and rules as the lands initially conveyed to the United States in the exchange transaction.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1181), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to complete authorized land exchanges if the lands offered to the United States are worth at least two-thirds of the value of the Federal lands and the balance is paid in cash or a cash deposit or performance bond is given assuring conveyance to the United States of additional acceptable lands for the balance of the value. Amounts received, forfeited deposits, and collections on bonds would be covered into a special fund and when appropriated would be available for acquisition of lands in the same State as the Federal lands conveyed.

#### MOUNT ROGERS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, JEFFERSON NATIONAL FOREST, VA.

The bill (H.R. 10366) to establish the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1182), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for the establishment of the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia. All of the lands in the proposed area were within the forest boundaries on January 1, 1965, so that moneys appropriated from the land and water conservation fund may be used pursuant to section 6(a)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 for the acquisition of private lands within the area. The proposed area consists of 154,000 acres, of which 84,000 are now in Federal ownership. Of the remaining 70,000, the Department of Agriculture advises that it would acquire the fee or easements on 39,000. Total acquisition costs are estimated at \$3,100,000, and development costs are estimated at \$18,900,000.

#### AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S.

693) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, which were on page 4, line 15, strike out "party." and insert:

party;

(q) For the purpose of section 3 (d) hereof, activities in furtherance of the bona fide commercial, industrial, or financial interests of a domestic person engaged in substantial commercial, industrial, or financial activities in the United States shall not be deemed to serve predominantly a foreign interest because such activities also benefit the interests of a foreign person engaged in bona fide trade or commerce which is owned or controlled by, or which owns or controls, such domestic person: *Provided*, That such foreign person is not, and such activities are not directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in substantial part by, a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party: *And provided further*, That the identity of such foreign person is disclosed to the agency or official of the United States with whom such activities are conducted.

And on page 8, strike out lines 15 through 19, inclusive, and insert:

(g) Any person qualified to practice law, insofar as he engages or agrees to engage in the legal representation of a foreign principal before any court of law or any agency or official of the Government of the United States (other than a Member or committee of either House of Congress): *Provided*, That in representing the interests of such foreign principal before any such agency or official the fact of such representation and the identity of such foreign principal shall be disclosed to the agency or official concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to S. 693 and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### LEGISLATION PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I believe it would be helpful to all Senators if I were to inquire now—and I do—as to the schedule which my able friend from Louisiana, the acting majority leader, plans for the Senate for the remainder of today, and later on in the week, if he is in a position to tell us.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When we conclude the morning hour, we will go on to the loan participation measure which is subject to a unanimous-consent request before the Senate, and that, of course, is subject to the 1-hour limitation, the time to be equally controlled by the opponents and the proponents.

When that has been disposed of, we intend to move to consider the Treasury, Post Office appropriation bill which will be managed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

We hope to have committee reports, perhaps today, on the Federal pay bill, the military construction bill, and the District of Columbia parking bill. When those bills have been reported, we pro-

pose to proceed as soon as possible upon them.

Prior to that, we hope, at the conclusion of business today, that we would be able to discuss the space authorization bill to be managed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It would be my thought that the Senator might wish to make an opening statement and get the bill officially before the Senate when we meet tomorrow and discuss the space authorization bill tomorrow. Then we would have available the Federal pay bill, the military construction bill, and the District of Columbia parking bill for discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend very much.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When these matters have been acted on, and other matters reported by the committees, we might wish to call up during the latter part of the week the truth-in-packaging bill, but I will discuss that with the distinguished Senator, the acting minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; so that there are no plans about that for the moment.

Mr. KUCHEL. So that the RECORD may be clear, let me say that I have been requested by members of the minority to urge that that legislation be considered at some subsequent date, all of which I would be glad to discuss with the Senator from Louisiana later on.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It will certainly be practical to do that. There have been no firm plans on it.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of nominations was submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and seventeen postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.







# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 15, 1966  
For actions of July 14, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 112

### CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	16	Fish protein.....	14	Public works.....	23
Agricultural		Food prices.....	18	Reclamation.....	2
appropriations.....	4	Foreign aid.....	15	Recreation.....	6,7
Appropriations.....	4	Forestry.....	6,7	School milk.....	3
Community development...	19	Loans.....	8	Soil surveys.....	5
Dairy.....	22	Opinion poll.....	11	Time.....	21
Economy.....	9	Postal service.....	24	Water pollution.....	12
Farm program.....	10	Poverty.....	13	Wheat.....	1
Farmers.....	20	President's speech.....	17		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate approved extension of International Wheat Agreement. House passed foreign aid authorization bill.

### SENATE

1. WHEAT. Agreed to a protocol for extension of the International Wheat Agreement until July 31, 1967. pp. 14936-8
2. RECLAMATION. Sen. Moss commended and inserted an editorial favoring the Central Arizona project dams on the Colorado River. pp. 14922-3

3. MILK. Sen. Proxmire stated he will follow closely the school milk program to ascertain if the funds appropriated are "adequate." p. 14922
4. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to limit debate to one hour on each amendment to H. R. 14596, the agricultural appropriation bill, when the bill is considered today, July 15. p. 14942

HOUSE

5. SOIL SURVEYS. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 902, amended, to authorize this Department to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development. p. D622-3
  6. FORESTS. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 954, for the relief of certain persons having summer homes in the Pinecrest Recreation Area, Stanislaus National Forest. p. D623
  7. RECREATION. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 936, to establish in Mich. the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore; H. R. 2778, amended, to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area; and H. R. 8678, amended, to establish in Mich. the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore. p. D623
  8. LOANS. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 15510, to authorize this Department to hold prepayments made to the Secretary by insured-loan borrowers and transmit them to the holder of the note in installments as they become due. p. D623
  9. ECONOMY. Rep. Ullman expressed concern for the future of the economy "because of skyrocketing interest rates and the critical imbalance in the national money supply." pp. 15034-6
  10. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Andrews, N. Dak., claimed there is an "anti-farm attitude of this administration with its hide export controls, cheese import increases and the cutbacks of domestic meat purchases for the military, reductions in school lunch and school milk funds--all designed to push down farm prices." p. 15037
  11. OPINION POLL. Rep. Wydler inserted the results of a questionnaire including items of interest to this Department. p. 15053
  12. WATER POLLUTION. Rep. Devine commended and inserted a speech by Rep. Cramer on the Federal water pollution control programs. pp. 15053-6
  13. POVERTY. Rep. Cramer inserted an article bringing to light "further irregularities in the administration of the war on poverty on the west coast of Florida." pp. 15057-8
- The Rules Committee was granted until midnight July 15 to file a report on H. R. 15111, to make various amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. p. 14991







July 19, 1966

12. SOIL SURVEYS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 902, amended, to authorize this Department to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development. p. D640
13. LOANS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 15510, to authorize this Department to hold prepayments made to the Secretary by insured-loan borrowers and transmit them to the holders of the notes in installments as they become due. p. D640
14. ACREAGE DIVERSION. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 14831, to amend the provisions of the law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program. p. D640
15. FORESTRY. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee" adopted a committee resolution, which disposes of H. R. 954 and related bills, for the relief of certain persons having summer homes in the Pinecrest Recreation Area, in the Stanislaus National Forest." p. D640-1  
Rep. Wyatt stated that "an imminent and real disaster threatens the timber industry" because "high interest rates on mortgage loans are putting a virtual brake on new commitments for home construction." pp. 15498-9
16. POVERTY. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 15111, proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. p. 15510
17. APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H. R. 15941, the defense appropriation bill. The bill includes funds for milk for military personnel, which previously had been financed by USDA. pp. 15442-88
18. CONSERVATION. Rep. Edmondson commended the approval by Secretary Freeman of the Cherokee Hills Resource, Conservation, and Development project, Okla. p. 15494
19. PERSONNEL; SALARIES. Rep. Flynt spoke in favor of his bill H. R. 16302, to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees. pp. 15493-4
20. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS. Rep. Curtis inserted articles discussing the National Foreign Trade Council forecast of a 1966 balance-of-payments deficit twice that of 1965. p. 15496
21. BUDGET. Reps. Albert, Boggs, Mahon, and Sikes commended the fiscal 1966 budget results announced July 19. pp. 15503-4

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. INFLATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Curtis inserting an article, "Inflation Still Gnaws the Economy: Big Brother the Villain", and stating that "it is to be commended for laying the blame for the recent inflation at the administration's door." p. A3790

23. FARM CREDIT. Speech in the House by Rep. Teague urging passage of legislation to simplify the laws of the Farm Credit Administration. p. A3790
24. MILK. Extension of remarks of Rep. Callan stating that a proposal has been offered by the Food and Drug Admin. in which certain foods are allowed to be vitamin fortified and others are not, and that milk is one of those products in which vitamin fortifying is not allowed. pp. A3801-2
25. POVERTY. Rep. McCarthy inserted a three-part editorial review of the war on poverty. pp. A3810-1

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. HOLIDAYS. H. R. 16335 by Rep. Fulton of Pa., to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to Judiciary Committee.  
H. J. Res. 1214 by Rep. Schisler, declaring the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year to be a legal public holiday; to Judiciary Committee.
27. WATERSHEDS. H. Con. Res. 833 by Rep. Davis of Ga., H. Con. Res. 834 by Rep. Greigg, H. Con. Res. 835 by Rep. Hansen of Iowa, H. Con. Res. 836 by Rep. O'Neal of Ga., and H. Con. Res. 838 by Rep. Stephens, urging the Bureau of the Budget to avoid delay in submission of watershed improvement plans; to Agriculture Committee.

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

28. PERSONNEL; PAY. H. R. 14122, the Federal employees pay bill. Approved July 18, 1966 (Public Law 89-504).

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS JULY 20:

Disaster relief bills, H. Public Works (Polk, FHA, to testify).

Food for freedom bill, S. Agriculture (exec).

Child nutrition bills, H. Agriculture (exec), and H. Education and Labor (exec).

oOo







# *DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings*

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued August 4, 1966  
For actions of August 3, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 126

## CONTENTS

Animal disease.....6	Food-for-peace.....19	Organization of Congress.7
Child nutrition.....1	Food supply.....8	Participation sales.....26
Civil rights.....4	Foreign aid.....19	Reclamation.....13
Clean air.....23	Grain.....12	Recreation.....9,16
Conservation.....20	Hides.....25	Research.....11,19
Credit.....2,10,26,34	Holiday.....31	School lunch.....8
Diet foods.....32	Housing.....15	School milk.....14
Electrification.....30	Inflation.....18	Soil surveys.....3
Exports.....25	Labeling.....21,32	Textiles.....24
Farm credit.....2,10,34	Lands.....11	Transportation.....15,29
Food prices.....5,14,33	Loan pools.....26	Water pollution.....23
Farm products.....29	Margarine.....8	Water resources.....27
Farm program.....22	Meat quotas.....28	
Farm research.....19	National park.....17	

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported child nutrition bill. Senate committee approved measure requesting USDA study of food price increases.

## HOUSE

1. CHILD NUTRITION. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment S. 3467, the child nutrition bill (H. Rept. 1802). p. 17370
2. FARM CREDIT. The Agriculture Committee reported H. J. Res. 1217, to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (H. Rept. 1803). p. 17370



3. SOIL SURVEYS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment S. 902, to authorize this Department to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies to assist them in community planning and resource development, including planning for such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities, and water and sewage facilities (H. Rept. 1804). p. 17370
4. CIVIL RIGHTS. Continued debate on H. R. 14765, the civil rights bill. pp. 17308-42
5. FOOD PRICES. Rep. Farbstein stated his intention to introduce a bill "to freeze food prices for 90 days, pending further recommendations from the Secretary of Agriculture or the President." p. 17307  
Rep. Abernethy called the "increased cost of bread and other foods...unjustified" and stated that these high costs "cannot be attributed" to the farmer. p. 17307
6. ANIMAL DISEASE. Rep. Cunningham stated that he had asked this Department to intervene to save the lives of 54 wild animals destined for U. S. zoos. p. 17341  
Rep. Resnick stated that "rigid safeguards" are necessary to protect livestock and wildlife in this country against the introduction of devastating diseases. pp. 17345-6
7. ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS. Rep. Curtis inserted the supplemental views of Reps. Hall and Cleveland and himself to the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. pp. 17346-49
8. FOOD SUPPLY. Rep. Halpern commended the use of margarine for the school lunch program and the armed forces. p. 17357
9. RECREATION. Rep. Farnsley expressed pleasure over the announcement of a "\$3.9 million grant...to develop a State park and recreational area at western Kentucky's new Barkley Lake." p. 17368  
Rep. O'Neill, Mass., spoke in favor of the bill to establish the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway, N. Y., and inserted a supporting article. p. 17368

#### SENATE

10. FARM CREDIT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 178, to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (S. Rept. 1427). p. 17204
11. LANDS; RESEARCH. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 3421, to authorize this Department to convey certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska (S. Rept. 1426). p. 17204  
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3178, to eliminate certain gaps in Interior's exchange authority under the Taylor Grazing Act. p. D710
12. GRAIN. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3585, to amend the Grain Standards Act to permit the inspection of certain grain thereunder on the basis of submitted samples. p. D709

## SOIL INFORMATION ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

---

AUGUST 3, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the  
following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 902]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill  
(S. 902) having considered the same, report favorably thereon with  
amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 3, line 10, strike the word "full".

Page 3, following line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall  
not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by  
private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling  
and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific  
engineering works.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to clarify and restate policy for the  
Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies relating to  
work in areas of rapid changes in land use, specifically fuller utiliza-  
tion by local agencies of the results of the national cooperative soil  
survey carried out by the Soil Conservation Service. The bill would  
facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies,  
including community development districts, both in rural areas  
undergoing drastic changes in land use and in areas of rapid develop-  
ment or urbanization.

#### NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The following explanation from Senate Report No. 1180 accom-  
panying S. 902 sets forth in some detail the need for this legislation.

## NEED FOR THE BILL

Community development districts, soil conservation districts, planning and zoning boards and commissions, and other local units of government need soil surveys as a basis for developing long-range plans and programs for the orderly development of rural communities and the renewal of natural resources in areas of rapidly changing land use.

Traditionally, soil surveys have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of a soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreational facilities. Soil surveys include maps of the kinds of soil, which are interpreted according to such qualities as soil wetness, overflow hazards, depth to rock, hardpans, permeability, erodibility, shrink-swell potential, and hazard of slippage on slopes. Soil surveys provide information that can be used to predict the results of using specific kinds of soil in different ways.

The enactment of this bill would clarify and restate policy for the Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies about work in areas of rapid changes in land use and where careful advanced planning is essential to avoid huge losses of both private and public investments. It would facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in both rural areas undergoing drastic changes in land use and in areas of rapid development. In many areas soil surveys are essential for community planning. Enactment of this bill would provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities. It is not intended that soil surveys would be made of the built-up centers of metropolitan areas.

The Department of Agriculture, with its cooperators in the National Cooperative Soil Survey, has responsibility for soil surveys and has a trained staff of capable specialists to provide essential technical information about soil, water, and plant resources needed by community planners and others. The bill extends methods already tested and known to help develop solutions to problems in community planning and the safe and efficient use of soil and water resources.

The increased demands for soil surveys in areas of rapid growth and for community development would be provided for by the enactment of this bill. The important task of making soil surveys on the farm and ranchlands of the Nation would be maintained in proper balance.

Many local units of government already contribute funds to assist the Department of Agriculture and its cooperators in carrying out soil surveys urgently needed for planning ahead of rapid growth or land-use adjustment. Funding arrangements are included in cooperative agreements between the Soil Conservation Service and the applicable local



unit government. The enactment of this bill would stimulate more local effort and financing for soil surveys in specific areas. It will not cost any appreciable amount of additional Federal funds.

In addition to the assistance of the State agricultural experiment stations and other State agencies, in fiscal year 1966 the Department of Agriculture made financial arrangements with local governments for contributions amounting to approximately \$600,000 for speeding up the completion of soil surveys in specific areas. In fiscal year 1964 these local contributions totaled about \$225,000.

In a great many parts of the country a clear-cut distinction no longer exists between rural and urban living. As modern highways are built many nonfarm people establish their homes in rural areas. To achieve good living for both, advanced community planning is essential. Such areas have new and compelling needs for water management, sewage disposal, schools, recreation areas, and other facilities. Such planning requires accurate knowledge of the soils and their alternative potentials in order to avoid serious losses of investment and construction and maintenance costs. To solve these problems the results of the soil surveys and technical assistance should be available to the planning agencies, the residents, and other public and private service agencies.

At the present time, about 10 percent of the 50 million acres being mapped annually in the National Cooperative Soil Survey is located in communities facing urgent planning problems. Not over 10 percent of this, or about 500,000 acres, will be used for housing and similar intensive uses since about 10 or 15 times as much land as is needed for such uses must be surveyed in order to determine suitable alternative sites therefor. The land not devoted to such uses will be used for farming, forestry, recreation, and other less intensive uses, so that cooperatively financed soil surveys to determine sites for intensive uses helps to provide soil information for agricultural and other less intensive uses. At the present rate of survey work in communities facing urgent planning problems it would require some 20 to 30 years to complete the soil surveys needed by such communities.

In the meantime many costly mistakes would be made, mistakes that could be avoided through the use of soil surveys for a tiny fraction of the cost. Already the officials of hundreds of land-use planning bodies are depending on published soil surveys. This places a new emphasis and new urgency on the acceleration of their completion.

Soil surveys have already saved untold millions of dollars of both private and public investment. Estimates made by community planners of the value of soil surveys run as high as \$2 million per year for a county. Hundreds of examples have been cited where many thousands of dollars are lost annually through poor site selection for specific uses. In many instances amounts up to one-quarter million dollars have been saved by choosing the right site for individual

school buildings. Further examples of other great losses that can be avoided through site selection and the planning of proper measures include: Flooded homes and basements; failures of on-site sewage disposal systems; failures of buildings and highways due to poor-bearing qualities of soils; and excessive construction costs of roads, utility lines, pipelines, and so on.

We should double or triple the present rate of completing soil surveys in areas undertaking community planning to take care of rapid expansion and economic growth. This would mean mapping at least 10 to 15 million acres annually in such areas. At current price levels the cost would amount to about 50 cents per acre. At the present rate of completing soil surveys in such areas, population would have increased by 50 percent in the meantime. From past experience it is clear that enormous investments by individuals and by public agencies would be lost. These can be avoided by use of soil surveys. The enactment of this bill would give emphasis to the need for moving ahead to avoid these enormous preventable losses of private and public investments.

#### HEARINGS

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit on S. 902 and the following similar House bills: H.R. 2076 by Mr. Philbin, H.R. 6423 by Mr. Frelinghuysen, H.R. 13552 by Mr. Dow, and H.R. 13566 by Mr. Kee.

During the course of the hearings the Department of Agriculture stated that it supported the bill as amended and passed by the Senate and that it had no objection to an amendment proposed by the Consulting Engineers Council which will be discussed in the next section of this report.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendments are intended to reaffirm and ratify the policy of the Department of Agriculture of not engaging in the solicitation, promotion, or provision of engineering service in competition with private consulting firms.

The first committee amendment strikes out the word "full" in subparagraph 3 of section 2, relating to the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for use of soil surveys. This avoids any implication that the Secretary, under this legislation, would be required to furnish complete and detailed soil engineering assistance.

The second committee amendment adds a new paragraph at the end of section 2 which clearly stipulates that this legislation is in no way intended to authorize the Department of Agriculture, or any agency thereof, to provide or offer to provide technical services in competition with private consulting firms. This is a legislative ratification of the policy of the Soil Conservation Service, as stated by the Administrator, to urge local organizations engaged in conservation problems of a community nature to seek the services of private engineers.

## COST

As indicated by the statement of the Department of Agriculture, set out below, no additional cost to the Government is anticipated by the enactment of S. 902.

## DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

Following is the statement of Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, USDA, before the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit in support of S. 902.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to again appear before this subcommittee. I want to thank the chairman and each member for the courtesy and cooperation I have received as we have had opportunity to discuss soil and water conservation work and activities and to share in the overall efforts on behalf of the farmers and others who have interests in the conservation and development of the natural resources of the Nation.

Secretary Freeman appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture on June 9, 1966, and made the statement "We have become an urban-oriented nation, preoccupied with problems of suburban sprawl and inner city decay, social strife and congestion, rising welfare costs, and juvenile delinquency." Mr. Freeman suggested an alternative to change this movement to the large cities by increasing needed facilities and services in our small rural communities. He suggested community development districts as a way to explore this alternative.

Community development districts, soil conservation districts, planning and zoning boards and commissions, and other local units of government need soil surveys as a basis for developing long-range plans and programs for the orderly development of rural communities and the renewal of natural resources in areas of rapidly changing land use.

Traditionally, soil surveys have been used to identify prime farmland and to select areas suitable for different kinds of crops, grasses, and trees and for guiding optimum systems of soil and water management practices. The same basic principles of soil behavior are now used extensively to determine the use of a soil for houses, highways, industrial sites, and recreational facilities. Soil surveys include maps of the kinds of soil, which are interpreted according to such qualities as soil wetness, overflow hazards, depth to rock, hardpans, permeability, erodibility, shrink-swell potential, and hazard of slippage on slopes. Soil surveys provide information that can be used to predict the results of using specific kinds of soil in different ways.

The enactment of this bill would clarify and restate policy for the Department of Agriculture and its cooperating agencies about work in areas of rapid changes in land use and where careful advanced planning is essential to avoid huge losses of both private and public investments. It would facilitate cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in both rural areas undergoing drastic changes



in land use and in areas of rapid development. In many areas soil surveys are essential for community planning. Enactment of this bill would provide individuals and public officials with essential information for planning economic development and community facilities. It is not intended that soil surveys would be made of the built-up centers of metropolitan areas.

The increased demands for soil surveys in areas of rapid growth and for community development would be provided for by the enactment of this bill. The important task of making soil surveys on the farm and ranch lands of the Nation would be maintained in proper balance.

Many local units of government already contribute funds to assist the Department of Agriculture and its cooperators in carrying out soil surveys urgently needed for planning ahead of rapid growth or land-use adjustment. Funding arrangements are included in cooperative agreements between the Soil Conservation Service and the applicable local unit government. The enactment of this bill would stimulate more local effort and financing for soil surveys in specific areas. It will not cost any appreciable amount of additional Federal funds.

In addition to the assistance of the State agricultural experiment stations and other State agencies, in fiscal year 1966 the Department of Agriculture made financial arrangements with local governments for contributions amounting to approximately \$600,000 for speeding up the completion of soil surveys in specific areas. In fiscal year 1964 these local contributions totaled about \$225,000.

In a great many parts of the country a clear-cut distinction no longer exists between rural and urban living. As modern highways are built many nonfarm people establish their homes in rural areas. To achieve good living for both, advanced community planning is essential. Such areas have new and compelling needs for water management, sewage disposal, schools, recreation areas, and other facilities. Such planning requires accurate knowledge of the soils and their alternative potentials in order to avoid serious losses of investment and construction and maintenance costs. To solve these problems the results of the soil surveys and technical assistance should be available to the planning agencies, the residents, and other public and private service agencies.

Soil surveys have already saved untold millions of dollars of both private and public investment. Estimates made by community planners of the value of soil surveys run as high as \$2 million per year for a county. Hundreds of examples have been cited where many thousands of dollars are lost annually through poor site selection for specific uses. In many instances amounts up to one-quarter million dollars have been saved by choosing the right site for individual school buildings. Further examples of other great losses that can be avoided through site selection and the planning of proper measures include: Flooded homes and basements; failures of on-site sewage disposal systems; failures of buildings and highways due to poor bearing qualities of soils; and

excessive construction costs of roads, utility lines, pipelines, and so on.

I would like to comment briefly on S. 902 as passed by the Senate on May 23, 1966. For all intent and purpose, the amended version as passed by the Senate and the House bills H.R. 2076, 6423, 13552, and 13566 are the same. The revised wording in S. 902 states more clearly the intent of the Department relative to the need for soil surveys in areas of expanding uses of land for industry, housing, and other uses. The House bills read such that the Secretary of Agriculture needs new authority to make soil surveys in areas of rapid changes in land use. Soil surveys are being made in these areas now as these areas are part of the regular schedule for completing soil surveys. There is need for a clarification and restatement of authority and a need for giving some priority to these areas being taken up by the rapid changes to more intensive uses.

The amended version of S. 902 also stresses the making of cooperative arrangements with local units of government for making studies and reports for mapping in these intensive use areas and that public agencies entering into agreement shall bear a substantial portion of the cost. Although these cooperative arrangements are not new, they are not specifically mentioned in the House bills before this committee. We favor the present version of S. 902.

I would like to digress for a moment and discuss briefly some opposition that has been voiced following the passage of S. 902 in the Senate. Several members of the Consulting Engineers Council with headquarters in Washington, D.C., expressed concern regarding the intent of S. 902. They interpreted soil surveys as described in this bill to replace the need for on-site investigations for specific construction sites.

Members of the Soil Conservation Service met with Mr. Larry Spiller and Mr. John Gnaedinger of the council on June 10, 1966, and discussed Service policies regarding soil surveys and their use. Statements from the Merrimack County, N.H., published soil survey were used as an example of the kinds of soil engineering interpretations that would be made from soil surveys and their limitations for use under the act. These statements satisfied the two representatives from the engineering council and they expressed the opinion that based on this information they could support the bill. They agreed to work with the Soil Conservation Service in developing additional language clarifying the intent of the legislation.

We understand that the Consulting Engineering Council will propose the following amendments to S. 902:

Amend section 2, page 4, line 25, by deleting the word "full" from the sentence and by inserting the following new paragraph on page 5 following line 5:

"The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works."

Any sites of interest to consulting engineers would be specific construction sites. This amendment is not needed inasmuch as the soil survey program has never been administered so as to interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works nor is there any intent to do so. We would hope that this statement will provide sufficient assurance to the Consulting Engineering Council to satisfy its concerns in this regard. However, if the committee wishes to adopt this amendment, we would have no objection.

Soil surveys as completed by the Department of Agriculture and interpretations thereof, could be highly beneficial to those people doing soil testing work or engaged in construction engineering. Soil surveys show the location and extent of the different kinds of soil. They provide information about soil properties to the depth of about 6 feet and in some instances, predictions about soil behavior can be made to 10 or more feet in depth. These soil maps properly interpreted are a valuable guide to engineers regarding the kinds of problems they may expect such as wetness, rock, low-bearing strength, shrink-swell potential, and the like. Through the use of soil surveys, engineers can make more accurate estimates on construction costs and avoid many problems that might otherwise be encountered. The surveys also help them to determine the location and spacing of samples to be analyzed in the laboratory and the area under which the data can be applied.

Soil maps are not designed or intended to be used in lieu of on-site evaluation or sampling for specific construction sites. They are meant to complement, not duplicate, the work of the engineers. We have had numerous compliments from engineering firms on how beneficial they find soil surveys in carrying out their work.

The rate of completing soil surveys in areas undertaking community planning to take care of rapid expansion and economic growth should be accelerated as rapidly as budgetary considerations will permit. From experience in the past, it is clear that enormous investments by individuals and by public agencies can be protected by means of soil surveys. The enactment of this bill would give emphasis to the need for moving ahead to avoid these enormous preventable losses of private and public investments.

I thank you for this opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit, and would be happy to answer any questions members of the committee may have.



Union Calendar No. 826

59TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**S. 902**

[Report No. 1804]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 24, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AUGUST 3, 1966

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

**AN ACT**

To provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That in recognition of the increasing need for soil surveys  
4       by States and other public agencies in connection with com-  
5       munity planning and resource development for protecting  
6       and improving the quality of the environment, meeting  
7       recreational needs, conserving land and water resources,

1 providing for multiple uses of such resources, and controlling  
2 and reducing pollution from sediment and other pollutants  
3 in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farmlands being  
4 shifted to other uses, resulting from rapid expansions in the  
5 uses of land for industry, housing, transportation, recreation,  
6 and related services, it is the sense of Congress that the soil  
7 survey program of the United States Department of Agri-  
8 culture should be conducted so as to make available soil sur-  
9 veys to meet such needs of the States and other public  
10 agencies in connection with community planning and re-  
11 source development.

12       SEC. 2. In order to provide soil surveys to assist States,  
13 their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation dis-  
14 tricts, towns, cities, planning boards and commissions, com-  
15 munity development districts, and other public agencies in  
16 community planning and resource development for the pro-  
17 tection and improvement of the quality of the environment,  
18 recreational development, the conservation of land and water  
19 resources, the development of multiple uses of such resources,  
20 and the control and prevention of pollution from sediment  
21 and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, in-  
22 cluding farm and nonfarm areas, the Secretary of Agri-  
23 culture shall, upon the request of a State or other public  
24 agency, provide by means of such cooperative arrangements  
25 with the State or other public agency as he may deem

1   advisable, the following assistance with respect to such areas  
2   and purposes:

3           (1) the making of studies and reports necessary  
4       for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil;

5           (2) an intensification of the use and benefits of the  
6       National Cooperative Soil Survey;

7           (3) the furnishing of technical and other assistance  
8       needed for full use of soil surveys; and

9           (4) consultation with other Federal agencies par-  
10      ticipating or assisting in the planning and development  
11      of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the  
12      work under this Act with the related work of such other  
13      agencies.

14       *The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall*  
15   *not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by*  
16   *private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling*  
17   *and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific*  
18   *engineeering works.*

19       SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the  
20   Secretary shall make a reasonable effort to assure that the  
21   contributions of any State or other public agency under any  
22   cooperative agreement which may be entered into between  
23   the Secretary and such State or other public agency with  
24   respect to a soil survey shall be a substantial portion of the  
25   cost of such soil survey.



1        SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated  
 2        such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of  
 3        this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

Passed the Senate May 23, 1966.

Attest:

EMERY L. FRAZIER,

*Secretary.*

Union Calendar No. 826

89TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**S. 902**

[Report No. 1804]

## AN ACT

To provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes.

MAY 24, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AUGUST 3, 1966

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed







# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued August 16, 1966  
For actions of August 15, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 134

### CONTENTS

Agriculture.....	24	Foreign aid.....	21	Poverty.....	4,23
Appropriations.....	8,9,36	Forests.....	29	Public debt.....	22
Balance of payments..	37,43	Grain standards.....	42	Public works.....	38
Civil service.....	28	Inflation.....	2,20	Reclamation.....	12
Conservation.....	18	Information.....	16,32	Recreation.....	39
Cosponsors.....	7	Labor standards.....	41	Research.....	34
Data processing.....	32	Legislative program.....	8	Rural America.....	35
Demonstration cities....	8	Lands.....	29	School milk.....	5
Diverted acreage.....	10	Loans.....	13	Soil surveys.....	11
Education.....	31	Manpower.....	33	Sugar.....	19
Farm credit.....	14	Minerals.....	7	Transportation.....	1,37,43
Farm program.....	6	Ocean freight.....	37,43	Water pollution.....	30
Food relief.....	15	Peace Corps.....	40	Water resources.....	27
Food prices.....	3	Personnel.....	17,28		
Food supply.....	26	Pesticides.....	7,25		

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House passed bill to allow planting on diverted acreage. Rep. Hansen, Iowa, commended rural conservation efforts. Sen. Tower inserted GOP research report on advance in food prices. Sen. Proxmire urged support for school milk program. Sen. Nelson stated farmer unjustly blamed for milk price increases.

### SENATE

- 1. TRANSPORTATION.** The Commerce Committee reported with an amendment S. 3391, to exempt certain water carriers from the provisions of the Shipping Act (S. Rept. 1459); and with amendments S. 3446, to consolidate and reenact certain of the U. S. shipping laws (S. Rept. 1460). p. 18536  
Passed, 65-18, with amendments S. 3700, to authorize funds for continued assistance in the development of urban mass transportation facilities. pp. 18573-95

2. INFLATION. Sen. Long, La., stated that inflation in the U. S. has been "small" in comparison with other industrialized countries and inserted data on the subject. pp. 18540-1  
Sen. Gore criticized administration tax and monetary policies and expressed concern about high interest rates. pp. 18574-5
3. FOOD PRICES. Sen. Tower inserted a Republican research report on the "persistent advance in retail food prices." p. 18541  
Sen. Nelson stated that farmers are not to blame for recent milk price increases and inserted an article on the subject. pp. 18567-8
4. POVERTY. Sen. Clark commended and inserted a series of articles on the Federal antipoverty program which report "some tooling up, some solid achievement, but much disorder and faltering." pp. 18546-54
5. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire urged early action on the school milk program. p. 18560
6. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Long, Mo., inserted a speech on farm programs by the president of the Missouri and the Midcontinent Farmers Associations. pp. 18566-7
7. COSPONSORS. Sens. Dirksen, Church, Bartlett, and Hruska were added as cosponsors of S. 3636, to establish a national mining and minerals policy; and Sen. Gruening was added as a cosponsor to S. 3608, to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the U. S. of DDT. p. 18540
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. H. R. 15941, the defense appropriations bill was made the pending business and Sen. Long, La., said it would be followed by consideration of the demonstration cities bill. p. 18595

#### HOUSE

9. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 15456, the legislative appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1882). Conferees had been appointed earlier. pp. 18442-3
10. DIVERTED ACREAGE. Passed as reported H. R. 14831, to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program. Rep. Poage stated that "This is a bill that allows the planting of safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, sesame, and flaxseed on diverted acres without payment for flaxseed and with a possible payment for the others of these crops provided that the Secretary finds they are in short supply and are needed by the country. He can then pay anywhere from 0 percent to 100 percent of the payments that would otherwise be due. Under the present law the highest he can go is 50 percent. Under this bill he can go to 100 percent of the support payments for these crops when he finds them in short supply and are needed by the country." pp. 18450-1
11. SOIL SURVEYS. Passed as reported S. 902, to authorize this Department to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies to assist them in community planning and resources development, including planning for such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities, and water and sewage facilities. pp. 18449-50



pected to be passed under unanimous consent.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to second the comments of the gentleman from Iowa, in pointing out that this is a most unusual procedure, bringing a joint resolution of this seriousness out under this kind of procedure.

One thing I would like to know—and we still have silence on the other side—is the view of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Let me ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]: Was this matter referred at all to the Banking and Currency Committee? This is where we vest the power, through the committee process, to look into all aspects of interest rates and the availability of money and the cost thereof. Was this referred at any time to the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. POAGE. No, sir; this was not referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. This involves an amendment to the farm credit laws of the United States, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and not under the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not yield further.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman asked for an answer, and I would like to give it.

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands the regular order, and the regular order is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I made the original reservation of objection. I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice. It is an important measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### SOIL INFORMATION FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 902) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 902

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the increasing need for soil surveys by States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource develop-*

*ment for portecting and improving the quality of the environment, meeting recreational needs, conserving land and water resources, providing for multiple uses of such resources, and controlling and reducing pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farmlands being shifted to other uses, resulting from rapid expansions in the uses of land for industry, housing, transportation, recreation, and related services, it is the sense of Congress that the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture should be conducted so as to make available soil surveys to meet such needs of the States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development.*

SEC. 2. In order to provide soil surveys to assist States, their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, towns, cities, planning boards and commissions, community development districts, and other public agencies in community planning and resource development for the protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, recreational development, the conservation of land and water resources, the development of multiple uses of such resources, and the control and prevention of pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farm and nonfarm areas, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the request of a State or other public agency, provide by means of such cooperative arrangements with the State or other public agency as he may deem advisable, the following assistance with respect to such areas and purposes:

(1) the making of studies and reports necessary for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil;

(2) an intensification of the use and benefits of the National Cooperative Soil Survey;

(3) the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for full use of soil surveys; and

(4) consultation with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work under this Act with the related work of such other agencies.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the Secretary shall make a reasonable effort to assure that the contributions of any State or other public agency under any cooperative agreement which may be entered into between the Secretary and such State or other public agency with respect to a soil survey shall be a substantial portion of the cost of such soil survey.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 10, strike the word "full".

Page 3, following line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

"The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely extends the principle of the soil survey of the Department of Agriculture which has been underway for many years so that adequate soil surveys can be expedited to assist with utilization of land areas which are changing their character as the result of the national growth,

The bill would expedite and advance the completion of the national soil survey of the Department of Agriculture which was authorized and directed by the Congress some time ago. Up to this time, this survey has been very helpful and since there is much of it that remains unfinished throughout the Nation, this bill moves in the direction of expediting the completion of the soil survey, it has been and will be extremely beneficial to many communities and States.

The bill will not only effect 100 to 1 cost-benefit returns to many, widespread projects, but it is also a sound, practical conservation measure which will continue, if enacted by Congress, to demonstrate its merits.

As I have noted, based on estimated benefits derived from soil surveys over a 25-year period by the Department of Agriculture, it is estimated that the cost-benefit ratios are about 100 to 1. In other words, the benefits from a soil survey will more than pay for the survey in 1 year's time.

As it can be seen, the benefits from soil surveys more than pay for themselves within a very few years, even for those areas of low intensity of use.

There are many savings possible for community, industry, and for the average person having need for the information available from such surveys. It is not uncommon, I am reliably informed, to get savings from \$30,000 to \$225,000 through the use of soil surveys in selecting a school site alone. Other savings made possible by use of the surveys are commensurate.

In my own State of Massachusetts, for example, local government officials, planners, engineers, tax assessors, real estate dealers, and many others can attest to the savings made possible through the use of soil surveys. In fact, these savings have exceeded the cost of making the surveys by many times.

Again, in Massachusetts a program was inaugurated to utilize more fully soil survey information in the solution of rural fringe problems. The town of Hanover was selected for a pilot project. The soils were mapped by the Soil Conservation Service and interpretations developed for some 10 specific uses, including such items as school sites, industrial sites for housing, sewage disposal, agriculture, and wildlife, et cetera.

The success of the Hanover program was such that detailed soil surveys and interpretations are being made by the Soil Conservation Service on a cost sharing basis for some 10 to 20 towns a year. In addition, the State legislature has passed legislation to assist communities in their conservation problems and there are presently over 200 local town and city conservation commissions actively seeking problems relating to the growth and development of their communities.

Thus, the soil survey program is directly responsible for rendering immeasurably valuable assistance in aiding States and local communities to solve the very challenging, oft-times critical problems, social, economic, scientific, and financial, stemming from the popu-



lation explosion into the rural fringe as well as those presented by our extremely compelling conservation problems too numerous to mention here.

I thank my very able and distinguished friend, the dedicated gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and his outstanding committee, for their long-sustained efforts for their very worthy bill, the enactment of which will prove so generally helpful to the Nation.

And I also thank the pertinent officials of the Agriculture Department, particularly, my esteemed and able friend, State Conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture for Massachusetts, who has assisted so invaluable in furnishing counsel and data concerning the bill and otherwise lending his talents in behalf of this fine bill which I introduced in basic form some time ago.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FALSE REPRESENTATIONS BY MAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16706) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16706

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:*

"§ 4005. False representations; lotteries

"(a) Upon evidence satisfactory to the Postmaster General that any person is engaged in conducting a scheme or device for obtaining money or property through the mail by means of false representations; or engaged in conducting a lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme for the distribution of money or of real or personal property by lottery, chance, or drawing of any kind; the Postmaster General may issue an order which—

"(1) directs any postmaster at an office at which registered or certified letters or other letters or mail arrive, addressed to such a person or to his representative, to return such letters or mail to the sender appropriately marked as a violation of this section; and

"(2) forbids the payment by a postmaster to such a person or his representative of any money order or postal note drawn to the order of either and provide for the return to the remitters of the sum named in the money order or postal note.

"(b) The public advertisement by a person engaged in activities covered by subsection (a) of this section, that remittances may be made by mail to a person named in the advertisement, is prima facie evidence that the latter is the agent or representative of the advertiser for the receipt of remittances on behalf of the advertiser. The Postmaster General is not precluded from ascertaining the existence of the agency in any other legal way satisfactory to him.

"(c) As used in this section and section 4006 of this title the term 'representative' includes an agent or representative acting as an individual or as a firm, bank, corporation, or association of any kind."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"4005. Fraudulent and lottery mail matter." and inserting in lieu thereof—

"4005. False representations; lotteries."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CROPS ON DIVERTED ACREAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14831) to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the handlers of this bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman want an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. We would like to have it explained.

Mr. POAGE. This is a bill that allows the planting of safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovate, sesame, and flaxseed on diverted acres without payment for flaxseed and with a possible payment for the others of these crops provided that the Secretary finds they are in short supply and are needed by the country. He can then pay anywhere from 0 percent to 100 percent of the payments that would otherwise be due. Under the present law the highest he can go is 50 percent. Under this bill he can go to 100 percent of the support payments for these crops when he finds them in short supply and are needed by the country.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think this is a good piece of legislation, because it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the ability to let the individual farmer adapt his farm planting of non-surplus crops to meet the needs of the Nation. There certainly should not be any objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, interrogating the gentleman from Texas further: Recently the Secretary of Agriculture, I believe, has substantially increased the wheat allotment throughout the Nation. Will the passage of this bill have any effect on the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture in increasing the wheat allotment as he has recently done?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the answer is "No, sir." This bill will have no effect whatever on the wheat allotment. I think the increasing of the wheat allotment will tend to reduce the acreage that might be planted to these crops. These are essentially oil seed crops of which we normally have a shortage at least of the meal they produce. Unless the Secretary finds in the year he

is going to make the payment that there is a shortage, he cannot make it, but it seems rather foolish to discourage the production of crops which are in short supply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso in paragraph (8) of section 103(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Provided, That the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of any agricultural commodity, if he determines that such production is necessary to provide an adequate domestic supply of such commodities, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such commodities."*

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (e) of section 339 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary may permit all or any part of the diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of any agricultural commodity if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed to provide an adequate domestic supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such commodities."

(b) The third sentence of paragraph (1) of section 16(1) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of any agricultural commodity if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed to provide an adequate domestic supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such commodities."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 103(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out of the proviso in paragraph (8) thereof 'crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'crops'."

"SEC. 2. Section 339 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out of subsection (e) thereof 'crops:' and the proviso immediately







# *DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings*

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued August 26, 1966  
For actions of August 25, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 142

### CONTENTS

Accounting.....46	Housing.....20	Property.....45
Acreage allotment.....32	Inflation.....36	Public Law 480.....16
Agricultural	Invasion of privacy.....19	Reclamation.....6
commodities.....6,16	Labor standards.....15,30	Recreation.....3,22,39
Appropriations.....9,25	Lands.....41	Research.....2,12,28,44
Auto safety.....23	Manpower.....8,26	Rice.....11
Barley.....32	Marketing.....31	School lunch.....9
CCC.....24	Marketing orders and	School milk.....13
Child nutrition.....21	agreements.....18	Soil surveys.....14
Conservation.....28,40	Metric system.....29	Transportation.....5,33
Contractors.....27	Military construction...24	User charges.....18
Dogs and cats.....48	Milk.....13	Vehicles.....17
Farm labor.....15	National parks.....34	Water pollution.....35
Farm program.....38	Organization.....42	Water resources.....7,37
Food for freedom.....1	Pacific Islands.....4	Weights and measures...29
Foreign agriculture.....10	Personnel.....19	Wheat.....32
Foreign service.....43	Prices.....47	

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared child nutrition bill. Senate committee reported food for freedom bill. Rep. Abernethy opposed limitations on farm program benefits based on size of operation.

### SENATE

1. FOOD FOR FREEDOM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with an amendment H. R. 14929, the food for freedom bill (S. Rept. 1527). p. 19663
2. RESEARCH. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 3460, to authorize Interior to enter into contracts for scientific and technological research (S. Rept. 1523). p. 19663
3. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with an amendment S. 1607, to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of Calif. (S. Rept. 1526). p. 19663

4. PACIFIC ISLANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 3504, to increase authorizations for the operation of the civil government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (S. Rept. 1524). p. 19663
5. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to the conference report on S. 3700, to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. pp. 19732-4
6. RECLAMATION. Concurred in House amendments to S. 490, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. The bill includes a provision prohibiting, for ten years, the delivery of water from the project for the production of basic agricultural commodities in surplus supply, unless the Secretary of Agriculture authorizes production in the interest of national security. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 19760  
Received from Interior a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 19662
7. WATER RESOURCES. Agreed to the conference report on S. 3034, to authorize the Interior Department to engage in studies of the feasibility of certain water resource development proposals. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 19761-3
8. MANPOWER. Sen. Nelson welcomed GOP support for the proposed Scientific Manpower Utilization Act of 1965. pp. 19779-83
9. SCHOOL LUNCH; APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Hart expressed disappointment in reduction of school lunch funds. pp. 19778-9
10. FOREIGN AGRICULTURE. Sen. Tower discussed land reform in Latin America and stated that the key to the economic development of Latin America is, therefore, the bringing into production of lands presently unproductive. pp. 19714-6
11. RICE. Sen. Mondale inserted an article outlining the efforts of the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines to increase rice yields through developing improved seed varieties and more effective farming techniques. pp. 19712-3
12. RESEARCH. Sen. Jackson stressed the need for this Nation to move forward quickly and efficiently in oceanographic research and development. pp. 19705-6
13. MILK. Sen. Proxmire stated that if additional funds are necessary for the school milk program they should be taken from public works moneys. p. 19702
14. SOIL SURVEYS. Concurred in House amendments to S. 902, to authorize this Department to provide soil information assistance to States and other public agencies to assist them in community planning and resources development, including planning for such facilities as highway construction, recreational facilities, and water and sewage facilities. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 19742
15. LABOR STANDARDS. Continued debate on H. R. 13712, to increase minimum wages and to extend such coverage to additional employees. (pp. 19727-32, 19742-59, 19763-76, 19785). Rejected, 37-51, Holland amendment to strike those provisions in the bill extending minimum wage coverage to agricultural workers. Rejected,



to acquire higher yielding loans outside the mortgage field.

This could happen, but it is extremely unlikely. Let me explain.

Under the \$1 billion special assistance authority, FNMA will have no authority to buy existing mortgages. The bill before us limits the funds for the purchase of FHA and VA mortgages secured by new residential units. No old mortgages could be purchased with this money.

Under the other part of the bill—the \$3.76 billion authority to purchase mortgages under the Secondary Mortgage Market—it is possible but quite unlikely that these funds would end up in other types of investments. In the first place, under existing regulations FNMA does not buy any mortgages more than 4 months old. I assume that this regulation or some similar regulation will continue in effect during the present emergency. If this is done, the answer to the Senator's question is obvious.

If, for some reason, the FNMA should remove this 4-month restriction it is unlikely that lenders would be willing to sell mortgages out of their portfolio at the price offered by FNMA. These prices are now about 95 for 5½ percent mortgages and most lenders would not be willing to sell at this price. In fact the price for other mortgages bearing interest rates below the 5½ percent are even lower. A 5½ percent FHA mortgage is priced at 91. An investor would have to take a very large loss, for example, if he wanted to sell old mortgages. From an economical standpoint this would not make any sense and therefore I think that even if the FNMA should change its current practice it is unlikely that many investors would find it economically feasible to sell mortgages at such low prices.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1966]

#### \$4.7 BILLION HOUSING BILL GOES TO SENATE

Senate-House conferees agreed yesterday on a compromise bill to pump an additional \$4.76 billion of Government Mortgage Purchase Funds into the sagging home-building industry.

In coming to a quick agreement on the legislation at their meeting, the conferees wrote in the highest possible figure by accepting all the devices carried in both the House and Senate versions.

Sponsors said the compromise measure probably will be called up in the Senate Wednesday and could be signed into law by the end of this week.

The new funds would be channeled through the Federal National Mortgage Association. They would apply to FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages.

The extra FNMA purchasing authority would be made available in these ways:

\$2 billion by authorizing the Association to issue debentures up to 15 times its capital instead of 10 times as under present law. This was in both versions.

\$1.76 billion by authorizing the Treasury to subscribe to an additional \$110 million of FNMA preferred stock. This also would be subject to the new 15-to-1 ratio. This provision was in the House measure, not in the Senate.

\$1 billion by authorizing FNMA to draw an additional \$500 million from the Treasury and \$500 million from special funds available to the President. The money would be for the Agency's special assistance function. This provision was in the Senate bill, not the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand it, the only way the Senate can approach the problem is first to vote on agreeing to the conference report.

If it should be rejected, a motion could be made to send the bill back to conference with instructions. I believe, first, a vote would come on the conference report, and if it is agreed to, there would be no other opportunity to get a vote. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope that the conference report will be rejected. If it is, I shall move to send it back to conference with instructions to insist on the Senate amendments.

Mr. President, once more I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to reiterate my commendation of the Senator from Alabama for his handling of this measure. We have produced in conference a highly constructive piece of legislation which I think will do a great deal to alleviate positive mortgage money in this country. To me, it represents one of the most significant pieces of legislation passed by Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas and I share his hopes as to the ultimate effects of this significant legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 7, as follows:

[No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Aiken	Gore	Montoya
Allott	Griffin	Morton
Anderson	Harris	Moss
Bass	Hart	Murphy
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Myaskie
Bible	Hill	Nelson
Brewster	Holland	Neuberger
Burdick	Hruska	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Pearson
Cannon	Jackson	Pell
Carlson	Javits	Proxmire
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Russell, S.C.
Church	Kennedy, Mass.	Russell, Ga.
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kuchel	Scott
Curtis	Long, La.	Smathers
Dirksen	Magnuson	Smith
Dodd	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dominick	McCarthy	Stennis
Douglas	McClellan	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Talmadge
Ellender	McGovern	Thurmond
Ervin	McIntyre	Tower
Fannin	Miller	Tydings
Fong	Mondale	Yarborough
Fullbright	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—7

Boggs	Lausche	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Prouty	Williams, Del.
Cotton		

NOT VOTING—15

Bartlett	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Bennett	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Gruening	Metcalf	Simpson
Hartke	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Murphy	Young, Ohio

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] a question.

On the basis of the conference report just agreed to, what effect will that have on a lumber industry in the Rocky Mountain region and the west coast, which is approaching a state of crisis in some areas?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should think it would have a stimulating effect. In fact, I would say it will have.

I might mention the fact that there is no industry that does more in providing jobs and getting funds into the hands of the homebuilder, the homeowner, and those interested in it, than the home-building industry, because it reaches out into just about all the reaches of our economy, even back to cutting logs in the woods.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that is the lumber industry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I had a statement at one time—I do not know whether I can find it now or not; if I do, I shall be happy to put it in the RECORD—that shows the effect on the economy of building, say, a million homes.

The statement follows:

The construction of a million homes is estimated to provide markets for 10 billion board feet of structural lumber, 1 billion square feet of soft wood and plywood, 1.2 billion board feet of flooring, 3.5 billion bricks, 1.8 billion pounds of cement, 1.5 million tons of steel, 10 million doors, 5 million kitchen cabinets, 20 million wall-plug outlets, 10 million electric switches.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I asked the question for the RECORD because, while I knew that it would have



an effect, it is nice to have it in black and white, and especially from the lips of the distinguished chairman of the Senate conferees; because in western Montana, while the lumber industry is still in fairly good shape, if something like this had not been done, it would be in pretty bad shape in the not too distant future.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will there be any area in the country in which the adoption of the conference report will not have a stimulating effect on the development of business?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe so. I think it will be nationwide.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does that mean that the passage of the bill will accelerate the rise of costs, and contribute to the conquest that inflation is making on our economy?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not agree with that. We discussed that matter in the course of discussing the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Quite the contrary, would not the Senator say?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, because housing, decent shelter, is as much an essential as food, medicine, and clothing. We do not think of those things as being inflationary. Why should we think of this as being inflationary?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure the Senator agrees that money pumped into the economy, regardless from what source it comes, does have some inflationary impact. If we pump \$3 billion additional into the economy—and I supported the first proposal of \$3 billion—it would have had some effect. The bill as just passed provides for \$4,650 million, or about \$1.25 billion more than the Senate bill and more than the President recommended; and it will have that much more impact. Certainly, as this new money increases the demand for refrigerators and all the other appliances, it will automatically and inevitably have some effect on the economy. Whether the advantages are offset by the disadvantages is another point. But nevertheless, Congress cannot appropriate any amount of money without having an impact; and, as the President pointed out yesterday, this continuous increase in Government spending is what is causing the threat of price controls, wage controls, and a tax increase.

That is the reason why I was reluctant to see the Senate pass a bill here this morning providing \$1.25 billion more than the President wanted, more than he said he needed. An extra \$1.25 billion which the President yesterday said would be highly inflationary if this were done.

I repeat again my hope and expectation that the President will use his veto pen. He has said that he is against this spending and if he is against it there is only one thing for him to do, and that is to veto some of these measures. I, as a loyal supporter of economy, will be here carrying his banner when the veto message comes back.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama had the floor immediately before the unanimous-consent request by the majority leader. I have a question to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I yield myself 3 minutes on the bill at this time, since we are operating on controlled time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that the communications from my State over the past weeks, received from people in different walks of life, point out that the drying up of mortgage money for homebuilding has virtually slowed homebuilding to a standstill. The greatest threat has been the decline in homebuilding and the absence of mortgage money. That is a greater danger than inflation. That statement has come to me from bankers, officials of savings and loan associations, homebuilders, and people in the supply business.

Does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama believe that the conference report that he sponsors today will help to stabilize the economy rather than unsettle it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does not the Senator believe that it will be a strong stabilizing factor?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do. An economy cannot be healthy if an appreciable part of it is unhealthy, and that is the situation which exists, so far as homebuilding and homeownership are concerned. An unhealthy condition does exist in homebuilding and homeownership.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the communications I have received state that young people, due to a shortage of money, are not able to get the downpayments with which to buy a home. Many young people have conferred with lending institutions and homebuilders. They leave with a sense of frustration and a belief that the opportunities which they had a year ago have dried up and have prevented them from becoming homeowners.

I ask the distinguished Senator whether the conference report which has just been agreed to will help to unfreeze the money for the building of homes and help the flow of commerce in that direction.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is our hope.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his great contribution in this regard.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4665) relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOCCS, Mr. KEOCH, Mr.

BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### SOIL SURVEY PROGRAM FOR GUIDANCE IN COMMUNITY PLANNING AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 902) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes, which were on page 3, line 10, strike out "full"; and on page 3, after line 15, insert:

The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for designs and construction of specific engineering works.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

#### FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes.

##### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona has been most patient and most considerate, and I think it is only fair to him and to the Senate to propound the unanimous-consent request, which I have discussed with the distinguished minority leader, the manager of the bill; the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the ranking minority member and manager on the Republican side [Mr. JAVITS], the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER], and the distinguished Senator from Florida and chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations [Mr. HOLLAND], as well as other Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on any amendment to the pending bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the manager of the bill, with the exception of the Javits child labor amendment, on which there is to be allotted 2 hours to be similarly divided and controlled, and the Ellender-Holland agricultural amendment, on which there will be 3 hours equally divided and controlled; and that debate on final passage









Public Law 89-560  
89th Congress, S. 902  
September 7, 1966

## An Act

80 STAT. 706

To provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture so as to make available soil surveys needed by States and other public agencies, including community development districts, for guidance in community planning and resource development, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in recognition of the increasing need for soil surveys by the States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development for protecting and improving the quality of the environment, meeting recreational needs, conserving land and water resources, providing for multiple uses of such resources, and controlling and reducing pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farmlands being shifted to other uses, resulting from rapid expansions in the uses of land for industry, housing, transportation, recreation, and related services, it is the sense of Congress that the soil survey program of the United States Department of Agriculture should be conducted so as to make available soil surveys to meet such needs of the States and other public agencies in connection with community planning and resource development.

Agriculture.  
Soil survey  
program.

SEC. 2. In order to provide soil surveys to assist States, their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, towns, cities, planning boards and commissions, community development districts, and other public agencies in community planning and resource development for the protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, recreational development, the conservation of land and water resources, the development of multiple uses of such resources, and the control and prevention of pollution from sediment and other pollutants in areas of rapidly changing uses, including farm and nonfarm areas, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the request of a State or other public agency, provide by means of such cooperative arrangements with the State or other public agency as he may deem advisable, the following assistance with respect to such areas and purposes:

Cooperative  
assistance to  
States and  
subdivisions.

- (1) the making of studies and reports necessary for the classification and interpretation of kinds of soil;
- (2) an intensification of the use and benefits of the National Cooperative Soil Survey;
- (3) the furnishing of technical and other assistance needed for use of soil surveys; and
- (4) consultation with other Federal agencies participating or assisting in the planning and development of such areas in order to assure the coordination of the work under this Act with the related work of such other agencies.

Types of assist-  
ance.

The provision by the Secretary of such assistance shall not interfere with the furnishing of engineering services by private engineering firms or consultants for on-site sampling and testing of sites or for design and construction of specific engineering works.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Congress that the Secretary shall make a reasonable effort to assure that the contributions of any

State or other public agency under any cooperative agreement which may be entered into between the Secretary and such State or other public agency with respect to a soil survey shall be a substantial portion of the cost of such soil survey.

Appropriation.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

Approved September 7, 1966.

---

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 1804 (Comm. on Agriculture).  
SENATE REPORT No. 1180 (Comm. on Agriculture & Forestry).  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 112 (1966):

May 23: Considered and passed Senate.  
Aug. 15: Considered and passed House, amended.  
Aug. 25: Senate concurred in House amendments.